Lewis S. Mudge

RECEIVED
JAN 1 1929
Mr. Speer

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

January 1,1929

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Avenue,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

In accordance with your suggestion I have written a letter to Dr. McEwan a copy of which I herewith enclose.

Ever affectionately yours,

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

January 1,1929

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

COPY

Rev. William L. McEwan, D.D.,
906 S. Negley Avenue,
Pittsburgh,Pa.

Dear Dr. McEwan:

You will receive as soon as my office force can prepare and transmit it the formal minutes of Conference #8 of the Group of Six, which was held yesterday December 31st, 1928. I have thought, however, that you might be interested in receiving some supplementary information. Of course, you must understand that this information comes to you bearing the stamp of my own personal impressions and has no official stamp upon it.

We were all exceedingly sorry that sickness in your home detained you and sincerely hope that your anxieties in this connection are now well past.

Dr. Macartney and Dr. Craig were present at our conference in addition to Dr. Speer, Dr. Laird and the writer. We had a very pleasant day together being in session from 10:30 A. M. until after five o'clock, with a brief period for luncheon which we enjoyed together having such sandwiches and beverages as each member of the Group preferred served in our meeting room.

Drs. Macartney and Craig were most cordial and friendly, but it did not seem to me that we made any impression upon them in our endeavor to convey to them our conviction that the only compromise promising success is the one Board composed of the existing Boards.

The letters received from the Faculty in response to the letter ordered sent the Faculty on December 13th, did not seem to me to reveal any substantial advance toward harmony and unity. They certainly do not reveal any willingness on the part of the Faculty to permit the Board of Directors to decide some things for the Faculty. I suppose it is difficult for the Faculty after their years of domination in the affairs of the Seminary and their great freedom of

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

action to adjust themselves to what certainly ought to be the relations existing between the Board of Directors of any educational institution and the Faculty of that institution.

Conference #8 left me with the decided impression that the power for leadership by our Group has been seriously impaired by the resignation of Drs. Warfield and Finney and the substitution by the President of the Board of Drs. Macartney and Craig as members of the Group. I had furnished Dr. Macartney and Dr. Craig with complete sets of our Minutes and with copies of all important documents. These they had had an opportunity to study for at least ten days. Naturally, however, in spite of all the information they had they could not feel in harmony with the Group or in sympathy with its aims. As I remarked above it did not seem to me that our very frank and informal conversation with them produced any marked impression. They both seemed to feel that the Thompson report can be defeated on the floor of the Assembly and that the Seminary can be freed to go its way with two Boards and little or no change in its charter and plan.

The afternoon session with the Committee of the Trustees did not from my view point yield any satisfactory result whatever. Certainly the Committee representing the Trustees have no intention whatever of recommending to the Board of Trustees cooperation with the Board of Directors in seeking one Board control, said one Board to be constituted of the two existing Boards nor has this Committee any interest of a constructive character in any part of the program of the Group of Six as adopted by the Board of Directors in accepting its report on December 13th, last. Apparently the Committee is entirely satisfied with Mr. McCarter's opinion and does not think the opinion of Mr. Katzenbach is worth the paper on which it is written. They frankly say that they are not afraid of litigation. They offer to transmit to the Trustees any communication which we wish to forward and as you will see from the Minutes it was voted to ask that our report as adopted by the Directors on December 31st, be transmitted to the Board of Trustees

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

with January 21st named a the date on or before which we desired to receive from the Board of Trustees the judgment of that Board with reference to the procedure therein suggested.

I suppose that the only thing we can do as a Group is to await the reception of the action of the Board of Trustees above referred to and base our next report to the Board of Directors upon its contents and probably also upon the letters receive from the Faculty in response to the letter to the Faculty ordered sent to the Faculty by the Directors on December 13th, last. If it be true as some insist that they are members of the Board of Directors voting for the proposition of one Board control said Board to be composed of the two existing Boards only that the mind of the Board of Trustees in this connection may be ascertained, we may find at the next meeting of the Board of Directors that our slender majority has vanished entirely. I suggest the desirability of considering at our next Group meeting what should be our course of action as a Group if we find at the next meeting of the Board our supporters to be in the minority.

I shall never regard as having wasted the many days that I have given to the work of the Group of Six and I am entirely willing to continue my relationship to the Group as long as the Group exists. Personally I do not desire to retire from the Group as an individual and so be perhaps a party to its disintegration, little by little, as originally constituted. I wish very much, therefore, that the four members of the Group which remain of the original membership might at some time and in some proper way come to some agreement as to what will be our course of action if and when we find our proposition supported by a minority only in the Board of Directors.

With affectionate regards and deep appreciation of your confidence and friendship, believe me

Faithfully yours,

As a member of the Group of Six from the Board of Trustees I would like to ask:

(1) What action, if any, did the Group of Six from the Board of Directors take on the response of the Faculty to their mandate. No report was given to us of the attitude of your group on this matter. Were you united as a group in any action relative to the response of the Faculty to your mandate?

(2) What was the attitude of your Group on Monday toward the setting up of one Board of Control as sponsored by the Board of Directors? From what Dr. Craig said I was led to believe that your Group was divided and that Dr. Craig still stands for a two-board control as suggested in his substitute motion, which was defeated by the Board of Directors by a vote of 11 to 10.

(3) I was led to understand from a pretty reliable source that Dr. Finney resigned from the Group, not because he was unwilling to give the time, but because he felt the case was hopeless. I was also informed that Dr. McEwan in an impassionate speech also resigned for this same reason.

Questions of W. P. Stevenson

Asked on Jan 4, '29

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, N. J.

PRESIDENT'S ROOM

Jan. 23rd '29

My dear Robert:-

At the meeting of the Board of Trustees - on the 18th Dr. Laird made a statement to the effect that the differences in the Faculty are not now acute - and that the replies of the professors to the mandate were what any one might expect from a body of men independent in their thinking, to a document more or less confusing in its character. From other sources - I have heard intimations intended to give the impression that the seminary troubles are theirs of the past - that certain men "have learned their lesson" and consequently no changes - or reorganizations are necessary - Erdman and I have

been going over the situation in a charitable earnest and prayerful way - and am convinced that any report to the assembly - assuming that differences no longer exist - and of a serious character - will be a mistake and will call for correction - the General Assembly of 1924 - after a full discussion - when the majority of the Dissidents had an ample opportunity to be heard - adopted the report of the Committee of Fifty - "under present conditions the drift of Seminary control seems to be away from the proper service of the church and toward an aggressive defence of the policy of a group" etc - see minutes pp. 131, 132.

This group is at present a coherent determined group - and it is dominating the whole life and work of the Seminary - and this in a way which plainly contradicts the deliverance of the Commission of 1925 - and the specific decision of the assembly in 1924 - viz - "no one in the Seminary faculty or in either governing Board

advocates or shows desire for such isolation policy as would harbour or encourage either in the Seminary or in the church at large influences even tending towards departure from the historic position of Princeton Seminary! In the face of this deliverance - an array of speakers is brought in for the Tuesday evening meeting and Sunday morning services - to convince the students that the church is largely apostate and that an intolerant and belligerent attitude towards fellow ministers is the need of the hour - Last Tuesday evening Dr Craig informed the students that there is "no end to those in the Presbyterian church" who deny the teachings of the New Testament regarding Christ - The League of Evangelical students under the patronage of the Faculty group assume that in every Seminary there are "two mutually exclusive types of Christianity" - Every those who join the

League - and subscribe to a programme of suspicion and strife - are worthy of confidence - and have a right to any place of leadership in the Students' association. The graduate student who is here on the campus promoting the League - has declined to go to the Foreign Field under our Board and is an appointee of the China Inland Mission. Moon and Moon the League is driving away from the Seminary the sons of our Presbyterian homes and institutions - who on coming to Princeton can not see their way clear to subscribe at once to the exclusive policy of "the Group".

When the Church was being racked and rent asunder by the old and new school agitation - Dr. Arch. Alexander could write to an alumnus - "We have had little division and contention and it has been our object to discourage the agitation of subjects among the students which have a tendency to enkindle animosities". We have just the reverse of that now - in consequence of which the faculty is divided - the student

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, N. J.

PRESIDENT'S ROOM

body is divided - and such suspicion and distrust is being engendered towards the Presbyterian Church - her Boards, Agencies and activities - as an intended to bring about an ecclesiastical split. This is what the committee of Six learned by quietly listening to the Directors - Trustees and Faculty members. It seems to me that the policy of the "group of Six" has been to ignore this as if it were a mistaken judgment which the last assembly repudiated by giving the Direction a mandate - even when it specified - "to compose differences". There is ample proof that conditions in the Seminary are as deplorable as they have been heretofore. That they can not adjust themselves - and any solution which ignores them - will be a great

wrong to the Seminary -

Faithfully yours

J. Ross Stevenson

20 LIBRARY PLACE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

Dear Robert

We are very sorry you cannot be in New York, Monday, but are compelled to discuss "the Princeton matter".

The latter is so simple that it would be absurd, were it not now so tragic.

Macken, Macartney, Craig Crane & Co. are attempting to establish their falsehood — viz that Stevenson or some one else is attempting to change the doctrinal policy of the Seminary.

This is absolutely untrue. That is the single, sole question at issue. The matter of one Board or two is purely secondary and incidental. The real question before the Board of Directors is a simple matter of fact.

Is Macken's "Attack on Princeton Seminary" true or false? That is the sole question.

"Ten Thousand" ministers and elders were led to believe

that someone will "to change Princeton doctrinal policy."

The whole church may be made so to believe, — and, on this ground, ~~was~~ the Assembly may defeat Dr. Thomson's report; — but it will always be your satisfaction to know that you have stood for truth against falsehood, for reality against unfounded suspicion. Stevenson has just shown me Craig's new pamphlet — It is a repetition of the old falsehood — that the question is one of "changing the doctrinal policy" of the Seminary — this he claims is the whole issue! It is a charge wholly untrue — we all are agreed as in our belief — and equally desire to maintain the historic doctrinal policy of Princeton.

Your outline for Feb. 18th is admirable! The only question is as to the allotment of time.

2. (1) "Proportion and Emphasis of different Objectives" — seems to me very important — and

3 (2) Cultivation of interest etc —

We expect from your outline a fruitful — helpful — discussion — and an inspiring day — appreciatively yours

Charles R. Erdman

Jan. 26. 29

Lewis S. Mudge

RECEIVED
JAN 28 1929
Mr. Speer

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

January 26, 1929

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.
New York, N.Y.

My dear Bobby:

I have just returned from my trip through the South, and find certain correspondence relating to the Princeton Seminary situation awaiting me. Thank you for sharing with me Dr. McEwan's letter addressed to you under date of December 21stand forwarded to me under date of January 4th. I herewith return this letter.

Yours very affectionately,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Wm L. McEwan

RECEIVED
DEC 26 1928
Mr. Speer

Third Presbyterian Church.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

December 21, 1928.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
Board of Foreign Missions
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City, N. Y.

My Dear Robert:

Dr. Mudge telephoned me and asked if Monday, December 31st, would be a convenient day for the meeting of our Group. As I had been so discouraged as to the results of the last meeting of the Board of Directors, I had not begun to think of when another meeting of the Group should be held. The replies from the Members of the Faculty will doubtless be in the hands of the Secretary by that time. I am very much afraid that the opposition of the minority to the recommendations of the Group will awaken suspicion in the minds of Members of the Faculty, and possibly cause some of them to hesitate to agree to the simplest, natural, and matter-of-course recommendations that could be made.

Whether the appointments by Dr. Alexander of members to fill the vacancies in the Group is within his prerogatives or not, I regard it as a strange thing that he should choose two men who had declared themselves unalterably opposed to the unanimous report of a Group on which they will be a minority. How Dr. Craig and Dr. Macartney could give their consent to serve under such conditions and in such relations I can not understand. I have not consulted either of them, and really am not concerned as to whether they serve or not. If they come with open minds to study the problem with us, it may be that they can bring some new light.

I greatly regretted the retirement of Dr. Warfield from our Group. I did my utmost, officially and personally, to persuade him to remain with us. It is almost impossible for new members of the Group to accept our present position, without having had the experiences through which we have come. It would have been better, in my judgment, to leave the vacancies unfilled, and have the Board weigh the report on its merits, and in view of the constituency of the Group. However, it is not mine to criticize the President, nor to question the right to serve of the new members, if they are legally appointed.

In my opinion, Dr. Craig's substitute is the most desirable solution of our problem. As a matter of fact, however, if I am rightly informed, the Trustees would oppose it vigorously. If the Trustees would accept his recommendations, and heartily join with us in asking the Assembly to deem them sufficient, we might have some hope of having the approval of the Assembly. I would not hesitate to vote for the lessening of the duties and functions of the President. I do not need to assure you that my esteem and friendship for Dr. Stevenson are sincere, and would almost measure up to yours. It was in all sincerity, and belief that it was for his good, that I joined in the request for him to demit the Presidency and accept the Chair of Homiletics. I think it would be good for the Board of Directors

Dr. Robert E. Speer December 21, 1928.

and good for the President, if he were not a member of the Board or of the Committees of the Board. He could serve the Institution better and escape many dangers if he were not a member of the Committees and the Board. The dignity and usefulness of his office are not dependent upon such things, and they are not necessary to his fullest usefulness and opportunity to serve. These things have been sources of friction heretofore, and it would be better for the President if they were removed. I can not understand how he would be reluctant to acquiesce in these propositions.

You speak of our present duty, "unless there should be another ~~matter~~ meeting of the Board of Directors which would reverse the actions already taken." I do not expect another meeting of the Board until our Group is ready to take the responsibility of calling it to hear our report and give us further instructions. At present we are directed by the Board to confer with the Trustees, to hear from the Faculty, and to seek a hearing with Dr. Thompson's Committee. Of course, the minority was very strong, barely less than the majority. The change of one vote would have made the minority to be the majority. The action of the Board constitutes our authority.

At the last meeting of the Board I was very desirous of having the issue made plain, and forcing a direct and final settlement of the question as to whether the Board of Directors would cordially adopt, and honestly urge, our report, and to leave the minority to take such legal action as would be within their rights. It would have been satisfactory to me if the Board had rejected our report. It is unsatisfactory to me to have so small a majority. It is an anomolous condition. I hope we may be able to present the matter to the Board at its next meeting in such a way that there may be excluded any extraneous questions, and the Board vote directly on whether it wishes to stand for the work of the Group or not. I consented to serve longer on the Group because I felt that we ought to continue until we are more sure of the mind of the Board. I confess to you that I have not much hope of having a unanimous Board behind us, nor of securing the cooperation of the Board of Trustees without having more unanimity in our Board. The outlook is very unpromising.

I can not escape the feeling that the adoption of the report of the Committee of Eleven would be a very rough and inconsiderate way of settling the problems of Princeton. It would be the summary dismissal of the Board of Directors. The impression would be made, and nothing that we could do would prevent it, that the position of Princeton had been authoritatively changed by the Assembly. All over the world the settlement of this question would be of interest. In my judgment, the way proposed by the Group would bring peace without victory for either side, and would indicate what is true, that the question is really one of policy and of administration, rather than theological.

We will go on as far as we think we are led. We will receive any new members of the Group that are rightly appointed, with less hopefulness as to having found the solution of the problem, we will do our best; and those who honestly oppose our suggestions and prevent them from being carried out, will have the responsibility for whatever may be the action of the next Assembly. I wish you a blessed Christmas.

Your friend,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl

Dear Robert: I am down to the limit with friends many and much embarrassed, added to the opinion with which is always heavy. What I am trying to say is that we have a solemn duty laid upon us directly by the assembly. Putting aside all personal preferences, we must be honest every measure that we can give account for our stewardship, and if our efforts all fail, we were not wise enough to meet all the problems, and God's will shall be done in other ways.

Wm L. McEwan

35

Third Presbyterian Church
Pittsburgh, Pa.

RECEIVED
FEB 4 - 1929
Mr. Speer

February 1, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
Board of National Missions
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City, N. Y.

My Dear Robert:

I have read your little book, "Are Foreign Missions Done For?". It is one of the best things I have known you to do. You have interwoven with the facts eo many fundamental truthe and so many moving illustrations and eo many heart appeals, that without definite effort one can not help but pray that it may be greatly used for increasing the interest and the gifts of those who love His Kingdom. It made me wish with a new fervor that one of my boys might be called for this service.

The title page states that the book is sent to some of the individual men and women of our Presbyterian Churches. If the book is available, I would like to secure a hundred copies to be sent by me to individuals who I think would be stimulated by it. Please let me know where I can secure theee copies.

I felt quite encouraged at the final vote of the Board of Directors last Tuesday. We still have much to do, and are more in need of guidance than ever before. From the beginning of our conferencee, indeed, from the time of the action of the last Assembly, I have felt a responsibility that has been overwhelming. The more I have gone forward in these conferences, the more has my judgment and my heart been set on the plan that we propose. I could not reconcile myself to the idea that the Assembly would summarily dismiss the Board of Directors. Such an action would be more of a rebuke than the Aesembly could mean and would do, I fear, injury to the evangelical cause. Our plan has met with much opposition and the attitude of the Board of Directors is most discouraging. The suspicion that lives behind the opposition is hard to remove. I do not want to jockey for place nor barter for majorities, and I still have confidence that fair-minded Christian men will do what is right when the issues are made plain and the responsibility is put upon them. When I say they will do what is right, I do not mean that they necessarily will do what seems right to me. Surely every member of both Boards who has taken the vows of service can be trusted, and, by reason of his experience, is better qualified at this time than a new set of men would be. Of course, there will be differences and suspicions if the two Boards are combined, but if all of us try to keep the right spirit and act in fairness and consideration, the old lines of division will fade away. I am still hopeful that we may be able to make such a report that Dr. Thompson and the Committee of Eleven will be willing to come before the Assembly and accept our report as a eubstitute for theirs. In such a case, there would be no need of debate and the whole church would rejoice in the settlement of the Princeton question in this way. We would be able to keep all the professors who are now in service, unless they themselves resigned, and to fill the vacant chairs with good men. I do not think Dr. Stevenson ought to reeist the provision by which he would no longer be a member of either Board, but come before them as the President to report and advise. He would be happier and a large cause of dissention would be removed.

Dr. Robert E. Speer February 1, 1929.

I hope Dr. Craig will not feel obliged to bring in a minority report, but even is he does, if Dr. Thompson's Committee joins us, the Assembly would probably adopt our report.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

February 2, 1929.

RECEIVED
FEB 4 - 1929
Mr. Speer

Dr. William L. McEwan,
Dr. Robert E. Speer,
Dr. John B. Laird.

Dear Brethren:

In accordance with the conclusions reached at our Conference held on Tuesday afternoon, January 29th last, following the meeting of the Directors, I at once wired Mr. Thomas W. Synnott and Dr. John McDowell as follows:

> "THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS RESPECTFULLY REQUEST YOU TO CALL A MEETING OF THE ENTIRE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THURSDAY AFTERNOON FEBRUARY 14TH AT PHILADELPHIA OR PRINCETON FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FROM THE GROUP OF SIX INFORMATION CONCERNING MOST IMPORTANT ACTIONS OF DIRECTORS TAKEN JANUARY TWENTY NINTH BY A VOTE OF FIFTEEN TO SIX."

A conversation with Mr. Synnott in his office and a telephone conversation with Dr. McDowell in his New York Office have convinced me that it may be wiser for us to follow the suggestions of Mr. Synnott and Dr. McDowell that we have a conference with the Conference Committee of the Board of Trustees prior to a meeting with said Board in its entirety. I have, therefore, taken the liberty of leaving to the judgment of Mr. Synnott and Dr. McDowell just what is the most tactful method of approach for us at this juncture to the Board of Trustees.

I am encouraged by the friendly attitude of Mr. Synnott and Dr. McDowell and I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have just written to them jointly not on my own motion but at their request. You will receive prompt information concerning further developments.

I have had no word as yet from President Alexander as to appointments to the Group vice Drs. Macartney and Craig resigned.

With kindest regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Group Secretary

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

February 1, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. Thomas W. Synnott, President,
Rev. John McDowell, D.D., Secretary,
Board of Trustees Princeton Seminary,

Dear Brethren;

In response to your joint request made by Mr. Synnott in person and by Dr. McDowell by telephone, it is a pleasure to communicate to you as far as possible the significance of the request which, by direction of the Board of Directors through the Group of Six of said Board, I wired each of you on January 29th, and as follows:

"THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS [illegible] REQUEST YOU TO CALL A MEETING OF THE [illegible] BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THURSDAY AFTERNOON FEBRUARY 14TH AT PHILADELPHIA OR PRINCETON FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FROM THE GROUP OF SIX INFORMATION CONCERNING RECENT IMPORTANT ACTIONS OF DIRECTORS PRIOR JANUARY TWENTY NINTH BY A VOTE OF FIFTEEN TO SIX."

The Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary at its meeting on Tuesday, January 29th, adopted by a vote of fifteen to six the following resolutions:

"That after conference with the Board of Trustees, the Group be and hereby is empowered to request the Chairman of the General Assembly's Committee on Princeton Theological Seminary to call a meeting of said Committee at a mutually agreeable time and place for the purpose of receiving from the Board of Directors through the Group of Six the following propositions:

"First, that the proposed new Board of Trustees of the Seminary shall be composed of the members of the present Boards of Directors and Trustees, as of October 1, 1928.

"Second, that the Charter amendments as proposed in the majority report of the Committee of the General Assembly with such changes therein as may be deemed necessary to provde for a Board of Trustees as above constituted, be the charter amendments which shall in due time be sought at the hands of the court of jurisdiction in the State of New Jersey.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

"Third, that the proposed new plan as contained in the majority report of the General Assembly's Committee, with, if possible, certain minor amendments herewith submitted, be the plan of the Seminary.

"Fourth, that the Group of Six be and hereby is authorized after further conference with the Board of Trustees, to prepare for submission to the 1929 General Assembly, the report of the Board of Directors, said report to be submitted to the Board for its consideration and approval in time for insertion in the 1929 General Assembly Blue Book."

For your information permit me to say that those who voted in the negative were Drs. Beach, Craig, Crane, Inglis, Macartney, and Frank Stevenson. You will observe that the adoption of these resolutions by so large a majority and by a majority made up of the most influential members of the Board of Directors, indicates a support for the purposes embodied in the above resolutions not hitherto bestowed upon them by the Board of Directors.

Drs. Craig and Macartney have declined further service on the Group of Six and it is our understanding that President Alexander will name on the Group in their places two members of the Board of Directors in entire sympathy with the views of the overwhelming majority of the Board as at present constituted.

Although to save time and for what seemed to be at the moment good reasons of another character, the Secretary of the Group was asked to arrange for a meeting of the entire Board of Trustees, nevertheless, I am sure that our Group of Six will be glad to confer prior to said meeting with the Conference Committee of the Board of Trustees, if such procedure should be in your judgment a wiser and more tactful method of apporaching the Board of Trustees.

I trust that you both appreciate that while what we will have to present to the Board of Trustees differs very little in letter from our previous presentations, it now has more in spirit because of the significance of the support which it is now receiving in the Board of Directors. Certainly this largely increased support merits renewed consideration and an

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

unprejudiced hearing of our proposals on the part of the Board of Trustees.

Knowing that your assurances ~~of~~ the our fresh approach to the Board of Trustees will be welcomed with all sympathy and cordiality are most sincere, and being assured of your wholehearted co-operation in this connection, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Dear Dr. Speer:
You will recall the conversation on train from Battle Creek. With all my heart I am hoping & praying for the right solution of this problem.
With warm regards, I am
Yours sincerely, S H Raccoch.
JB3

Dr.Lewis S.Mudge,
Philadelphia,Pa.

2-4-1929

Dear Dr.Mudge:-

Thank you for your gracious note. I was very sorry to miss seeing you,which is always a privilege enjoyed,and this time I coveted a few minutes for news of Princeton. Just before,Dr.Speer,Dr.Brown and I had had a talk. Dr.Speer,to whom I am sending a copy of this letter,was of the opinion that the Assembly had tabled the Report of the Com.of Eleven,meaning in effect to declare the same non-effective,and had consequently commissioned the Directors to work de novo a solution of the whole problem. Since that conversation,I have been very busy -never knew what it was to be really busy till I retired from the pastorate -and have been unable to give the Princeton matter much attention.

However,I have just been reviewing the history,and find myself against very great difficulties in accepting Dr.Speer's opinion.

1. The Assembly did not table the Report;the action was to postpone discussion.
2. The Assembly voted appreciation of the Com's work and requested the continuance of its services.
3. The Assembly instructed the Com.to submit nominations for the new Board,if and when the Report should be adopted,so indicating the possibility if not the expectancy that the Report would be adopted.
4. The Assembly's specific instruction to the Directors was to compose their differences and report to the Assembly.
5. The Assembly's understanding of the meaning of the preamble to Dr.Matthews' motion should be inferred from the Assembly's own actions,as above.The meaning of that preamble,harmonizing with the Assembly's actions would be either or both (1)that naturally after so much bitterness the situation would necessarily continue for awhile unsettled.This interpretation accords with Dr.Matthews' plea for the healing influence of time.(2)that even if the Reportshould be adopted it could not be legally effective, for a year,in consequence of which the situation would remain unsettled.

Under their instructions to compose their differences and report to the Assembly the Directors would of course be warranted in presenting any program that carried with it a composition of the differences.And if that feat were accomplished the Com.of Eleven would rejoice with exceeding great joy.We hope and pray for such success.

On the other hand,for the Directors to present a substitute program that did not carry with it a composition of the differences,I fear,would be going beyond Assembly instructions and tend to a graver situation than now exists.

My own deep and deepening conviction is that the matter ought to be finally issued at the next Assembly,and that the way to do that,in the event of the failure of the Directors to compose the differences in their own body,in the Faculty,and between themselves and the Trustees,is for the new majority in the Board of Directors,the Trustees,and the Com.of Eleven,to unite on a proposition to be presented to the next Assembly. That would go through,and while there would linger some sores,fewer of them would follow,and peace and full prosperity come more quickly.

Of course the Com.of Eleven has now no right or responsibility but to be ready for the postponed discussion next May,and with nominees for the new Board if the Report is adopted. Nevertheless all of us have a common interest in and responsibility for the welfare of the Church and its Seminaries.

With hearty good wishes,I am,

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

RECEIVED
FEB 7 - 1929
Mr. Speer

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

February 6, 1929

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

S

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Avenue,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

I have just received a letter from Dr. Luccock dated February 4th; a copy of which he indicates he has sent to you. I am, therefore, sharing with you a copy of my reply to Dr. Luccock.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

L. S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

February 6,1929

COPY

Rev. George N. Luccock, D.D.,
Wooster,Ohio.

Dear Dr. Luccock:

I have your letter of February 4th. My understanding is that the report of the Special Committee to visit Princeton Theological Seminary is before the next General Assembly as unfinished business and I have docketed it as such. General Assembly Minutes 1928, Part I, p. 59 contain a resolution proposed by Dr. Matthews which reads in part: " Therefore be it resolved, that the further consideration of said Reports (Majority and Minority Reports) from the Special Committee of Eleven on Princeton Theological Seminary, be postponed for one year." This seems clear enough and conclusive enough. The 1928 General Assembly ordered that further consideration of said Reports should be had at the 1929 General Assembly. Please note also the last paragraph on p. 59, which reads:

"The Majority and Minority Reports of the Special Committee of Eleven to visit Princeton Theological Seminary, were ordered placed on the docket of the General Assembly of 1929 for consideration by that Assembly, and will be found in the Appendix to this Journal."

Dr. Matthews' resolution further directed "that the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary be and hereby is instructed to proceed immediately to compose the differences at the Seminary and to make a full report on these instructions to the next General Assembly." It would seem to me that the clear implication is that pending the further consideration of the Majority and Minority Reports of the Princeton Committee the Board of Directors should make "a full report on these instructions." It would seem to me that this report may be in one of two forms: (a) A report that the Board has composed the differences at the Seminary with evidence in support thereof, or (b) that the Board has a plan to propose which it believes if given an opportunity to function will compose these differences. The evident intent of Dr. Matthew's motion was to send the Board of Directors home with the responsibility laid upon them by

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

the injunction of the General Assembly to compose the differences at Princeton.

I do not understand that the spirit of Dr. Mat'lews' motion is or even its letter that unless the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary can report to the next General Assembly that the differences at Princeton are totally a thing of the past anything else that the Board of Directors may have to propose willbe out of order. What the Assembly ordered in my judgment was that the Board of Directors should have an opportunity to compose the differences at Princeton. If the next General Assembly is satisfied on the basis of the report of the Board of Directors either that these differences have been composed or that there is a definite plan in mind by which in the reasonably near future they will be composed then what the Directors have to propose to this end is in order and to be considered on the same basis that the proposals of the Committee of Eleven.are to be considered.

I am most hopeful as things now stand that such a plan the Board of Directors will be able to propose to the next General Assembly, and I am sure that if such a plan is forthcoming the Committee of Eleven will rejoice that such a plan has been found.

With every good wish and rejoicing that your friends are sensible enough to keep you hard at work that the Church may have the benefit of your invaluable services, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Wm L. McEwan

Third Presbyterian Church
Pittsburgh, Pa.

326

RECEIVED
FEB 21 1929
Mr. Speer

February 19, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City, N. Y.

My Dear Robert:

The printer sent the hundred copies of the missionary book as you directed. I have received no bill for them. I will be glad to pay for them. I intend to send each one of them to a chosen person with my card in the hope that by so placing them, good may be done.

I have received Dr. Craig's second pamphlet. I do not admire it as much as I did the first one. I do not see how, after the full opportunity that was given in the last meeting of the Board for the support of his report, he could expect to move any of the members of the Board to change their votes. If he makes a minority report, I do not think he can get any signers unless it be Dr. Frank Stevenson, and possibly Dr. Crane.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S ROOM

February 20, 1929

S

Dear Robert:-

This morning I received from Dr. Langdale a letter stating that the Committee on Nominations desires me to accept appointment as Chairman of the Federal Council's Administrative Committee. I am greatly surprised at such a suggestion, since Dr. Marquis, a Presbyterian, was Chairman last year, and since Dr. Lingle, a Presbyterian, is Chairman of the Executive Committee, and I am wondering if an attempt is not being made to secure men more or less conservative for influential positions in the Council to off-set the criticisms that are being circulated regarding Bishop McConnell rating him as belonging to the extreme liberal camp. Not only on this account, but because of the situation here in the Seminary, I very much question the wisdom of taking this Chairmanship. As you know, one of the chief counts against me is my activity in interdenominational affairs. I had a long visitation last night from Professor Jenkins, trying to make it appear that my relation to this proposed union of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches is nothing short of treason. I am under the impression that you are a member of Langdale's Committee, and I am, therefore, writing for your best counsel on this whole matter. Evidently some of the Princeton brethren are deeply grieved over my activities in connection with the Department of Church Cooperation and Union. As I may have told you, some time ago Dr. Brank wrote me a long letter pleading with me to resign as a measure necessary to restore harmony in the Seminary. If I am to remain on in the Seminary, and I realize that strong emphasis needs to be placed on the "if", I cannot expect any harmonious relationship with the "majority" of the Faculty unless I sever all connection not only with the Department of Church Cooperation and Union but with all interdenominational enterprises.

I was deeply interested in what you stated yesterday as to the advisability of having the Assembly order the Directors and Trustees to establish a single Board and to take such legal steps as are necessary on the basis of the best legal advice obtainable to establish such a Board. It seems to me that this is eminently wise. I have been wondering if a procedure of this kind might not be possible in connection with the proposed changes in the Plan, especially as relates to the position of President. Since the President and his supposed administrative policies are under fire, it is certainly a question whether those who are greatly disturbed and in the main have been influenced by the suspicions and fears of the Faculty are in a position to calmly consider such an important matter. I am glad that I have not been consulted and consequently have not made a single suggestion. I can frankly say that the proposed changes of Dr. Thompson's Committee as they relate to the President are not satisfactory, and I do not believe would work harmoniously. You may be interested in the definition of the position and functions of the President of the

Lutheran Seminary at Mount Airy.

I am sorry that I brought up again the rather vexed question of doctrinal trustworthiness in the Faculty. As you know, Drs.Erdman, Loetscher, Smith and I have stood together in maintaining that there can be no harmony in the Faculty or in the institution until the majority of the Faculty are willing to obliterate the line which they have drawn and which they are still drawing on the basis of which they regard the four of us with suspicion and distrust. I have recently had a trying experience in connection therewith when I suggested to the Student Committee,of which Dr. Robert Dick Wilson is the Adviser, the name of Hugh Taylor of Siam as a desirable person to address the Tuesday evening meeting. This was in response to a request from Dr. Downs. I was arraigned before the whole Faculty for trying to usurp the authority of the Student Adviser, Dr. Wilson. When the Directors know what the real ground of difference is in the Faculty and must confess that their endeavors to compose these differences are of no avail, it would seem to me that the only recourse is not for the Directors to plan a form of organization which may as you stated in the long processes of time bring about a settlement, but to accept the report of the Committee of Eleven as offering an immediate remedy. Those of us who know the seriousness of the maladies here have little hope of the effectiveness of any homeopathic treatment when a surgical operation is absolutely necessary.

Affectionately yours,

J. Ross Stevenson

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
New York City.

Inauguration Pledge

President Jacobs of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

My dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Board of Directors of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, acting under the powers conferred upon it by the charter and by-laws of the Seminary, has elected and called you to the office of President.

In this office it will be your duty "to exercise general supervision over the work of the institution, to provide for the co-ordination and development of the courses of instruction, to secure the enforcement of such rules as the Board of Directors may adopt for the government of the Seminary, to have general oversight of the internal management of the institution, and to represent the Seminary in its relations with other institutions of learning and with outside interests."

I therefore ask you, Do you accept these duties as your own, and do you promise to discharge them, with the help of God, to the best of your ability?

Answer: I do.

As a professor in this Seminary you have already promised that all your teaching shall be in conformity with the Holy Scriptures and with the Confessions of the Lutheran Church.

I now ask you, Do you renew that promise, and do you promise further that in the administration of the office of President you will use every effort to keep the Seminary and its teaching faithful to these, the doctrinal standards of the Evangelical Lutheran Church?

Answer: I do.

Upon this your promise, and by the authority of the Board of Directors, I do now confer upon you the office of President of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. May you be wise and faithful in the administration of your office, and may the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost accompany you in the work that you shall do for Him. Amen.

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

February 28, 1929.

RECEIVED
MAR 2 - 1929

Mr. Speer

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE GROUP OF SIX

Dear Brethren:

I have just wired each of you as follows, after conference in person or by telephone with the members of the Group within easy reach:

> "CHAIRMAN GROUP OF SIX CALLS MEETING THURSDAY MARCH FOURTEENTH TEN THIRTY A M ROOM FOUR EIGHTEEN WITHERSPOON BUILDING PHILADELPHIA FOR PURPOSE OF CONFERRING WITH CONFERENCE COMMITTEE OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND FOR SUCH OTHER BUSINESS AS MAY PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE GROUP. LETTER EXPLAINING SITUATION FOLLOWS."

Since our last meeting your Secretary has had conferences with the members of the Group with whom he was able to get in touch, namely, Drs. McEwan, Laird and Speer. He has also paid two visits to the Office of the President of the Board of Trustees and two visits to the Office of the Secretary of the Board of Trustees.

At a conference held in Atlantic City at which were present Drs. McEwan, Laird and Mudge, all of whom were in attendance at a meeting of the Western Section of the Presbyterian Allianoe, it was agreed upon that we should endeavor to secure the following meetings, Thursday, March 14th, morning conference between our Group and the conference Committee of the Board of Trustees; Thursday afternoon, March 14th, meeting of the Board of Trustees; Friday, March 15th, meeting of the Board of Directors.

In an endeavor to make these arrangements your Secretary forwarded to Mr. Synnott and to Dr. McDowell a telegram to this effect the contents of which were read to and approved by Dr. McEwan and Dr. Laird. He received this morning in reply to this telegram a telephone call from Dr. McDowell, who referred him to Mr. Synnott for the answer of the Conference Committee of the Board of Trustees to our request as above outlined. Your Secretary spent half an hour with Mr. Synnott this afternoon in an endeavor to persuade him to accede to our request. However, Mr. Synnott was immovable and the best your Secretary could obtain was Mr.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Synnott's assent to a conference with the Committee of the Board of Trustees .

With the approval of our Chairman and of Dr. Speer, who are the only members of the Group of Six whom he could reach promptly this afternoon, a conference has been arranged for Thursday, March 14th, in Room 418 Witherspoon Building, at 10.30 A.M., this being the first date on which it seemed possible to obtain an attendance of a majority of either our Group or of the Board of Trustees. Your Secretary deeply regrets that an earlier date seemed impossible. He begs to assure you that he has spared neither time nor expense in arranging this conference for the earliest possible time.

With kind regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

L. S. M.

Lewis S. Mudge
Group Secretary

Form 1220-S

CLASS OF SERVICE

This is a full-rate Telegram or Cablegram unless its character is indicated by a symbol in the check or in the address.

RECEIVED MAR 4 1929 Mr. Speer

WESTERN UNION

NEWCOMB CARLTON, PRESIDENT — J. C. WILLEVER, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

SYMBOLS	
BLUE	Day Letter
NITE	Night Message
NL	Night Letter
LCO	Deferred
CLT	Cable Letter
WLT	Week End Letter

The filing time as shown in the date line on full-rate telegrams and day letters, and the time of receipt at destination as shown on all messages, is STANDARD TIME.

Received at 775 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK

PA33 70 DL WO PHILADELPHIA PENN 4 1250P 1929 MAR 4 PM 1 06

DR ROBERT E SPEER=

156 FIFTH AVE NEWYORK NY=

THE FOLLOWING ARRANGEMENTS HAVE BEEN DEFINITELY MADE STOP THURSDAY MORNING MARCH FOURTEENTH TEN THIRTY OCLOCK MEETING GROUP OF SIX FOUR EIGHTEEN WITHERSPOON BUILDING STOP THURSDAY AFTERNOON MARCH FOURTEENTH TWO THIRTY OCLOCK MEETING BOARD OF TRUSTEES SAME ROOM GROUP TO APPEAR BEFORE BOARD STOP THURSDAY EVENING MARCH FOURTEENTH MEETING GROUP OF SIX TO PREPARE REPORT STOP FRIDAY MORNING MARCH FIFTEENTH ELEVEN OCLOCK OLD ORATORY PRINCETON MEETING DIRECTORS TO RECEIVE GROUP REPORT=

LEWIS S MUDGE..

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

March 5, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

RECEIVED
MAR 6 - 1929
Mr. Speer

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE GROUP OF SIX.

Dear Brethren:

In an endeavor to expedite the business of the Group especially in connection with the preparation of its final Report to the Board of Directors, which is to be submitted on March 15th, your Secretary has compiled the enclosed form of report for your criticism. He takes no pride whatever in this tentative draft. Its purpose is only to stimulate your minds to thought and to crystallize your opinions as to what our report should ultimately contain. If criticisms of the enclosed tentative report are forwarded in advance, the work of our Committee on Thursday, March 14th, will be much expedited.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Group Secretary

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

MAR 19 1929

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

March 18, 1929

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
Miss Margaret E. Hodge,
Mrs. Fred S. Bennett:

Dear Friends:

Enclosed please find copies of two letters received this day from Dr. Mark A. Matthews, also copies of my replies. These are sent for your information.

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

March 18, 1929.

Rev. Mark A. Matthews, D.D.,
7th and Spring Streets,
Seattle, Washington.

My dear Dr. Matthews:

I have your letter No. 1 of March 12th. I am, of course, desirous of giving you to the utmost my official co-operation in the orderly presentation of your intention to ask the General Assembly, if the Council will not consent thereto at its May meeting to "postpone sending down the overture regarding women elders". However, I do not see how I can print a statement of your "notice" to this effect in the Blue Book. The Blue Book is an official publication of the General Assembly which under the Standing Rules is limited to reports which are in order for presentation at the forthcoming Assembly.

If you had filed this notice with me as Secretary of the General Council prior to the adjournment of the General Council and had requested that it be made a part of the Minutes of the General Council, or if you had asked the consent of the General Council to file such a notice with me as its Secretary at a later date for insertion in the Minutes, then I can see how it would be perfectly orderly for me to insert this notice in the report of the General Council as printed in the Blue Book. As, however, you did not take either of the above courses of action, I do not see how I can make the insertion.

Please do not misunderstand me. I have no desire whatever to hamper you in the slightest degree with reference to this proposed notice. You are entirely within your rights in proceeding along this line if it is in accord with your judgment. I am sure that you will not desire me to do anything which is not in strict accord with parliamentary procedure and in harmony with the rules and practices of the General Assembly.

Kindly write me again on this point and see if I cannot co-operate in some solution entirely satisfactory to you other than the one which you have suggested.

With warmest personal regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

(COPY)

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

SEATTLE WASHINGTON

MARCH 12, 1929.

Rev. Lewis S. Mudge, D.D.,
Stated Clerk.
514 Witherspoon Bldg.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

My dear Brother:

I am writing you four letters The subjects are not related therefore, read them in this order. This is letter No. 1.

Will you please print in the blue book a notice that I expect to ask the General Assembly if the Council will not consent at its May meeting -- to postpone sending down the overture regarding women elders? I shall present that matter to the Assembly and ask them to postpone it for one year. I think others will joine me in this same protest.

Very truly yours,

Mark A. Matthews (signed)

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

March 18, 1929.

Rev. Mark A. Matthews, D.D.,
7th and Spring Streets,
Seattle, Washington.

My dear Dr. Matthews:

I have your letter No. 2 dated March 12th. The General Council voted to recommend to the General Assembly the sending down of an overture to the Presbyteries of such a character as would eliminate from our Constitution all sex distinctions. I am preparing such an overture for insertion in the report of the Special Committee on the Status of Women in the Church, as said report will appear as a part of the report of the General Council to the next General Assembly. That I should so do, was understood at the meeting of the General Council that the precise character of the proposal in this connection might be clearly understood. Such an overture must have several paragraphs if the Constitution in all its parts is to be made harmonious on this point. Of course, when I have prepared the overture in my judgment best adapted to meet the wishes of the Council voted at its last meeting and have inserted it in the Blue Book in the proper place, it will be subject to criticism at, and if necessary to amendment at the Council meeting in May.

With kind regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

(COPY)

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

SEATTLE WASHINGTON

MARCH 12, 1929.

Rev. Lewis S. Mudge, D.D.,
Stated Clerk
514 Witherspoon Bldg.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

My dear Brother:

Even if wer were to consent to send the overture regarding women elders down to the church we can't send it in the form in which we left it the other day. We must send down one of the alternatives; we can't send them all down, therefore, the matter will have to come before the next Council meeting in May. Am I not correct?

With best regards, I am

Yours true friend

Mark A. Matthews (signed)

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

March 19, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

RECEIVED
MAR 20 1929

Mr. Speer

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

I have your letter of March 18th re Dr. Mark Matthews and the proposed overture relating to the status of women. It seems to me that we should go straight ahead with our plans which have behind them the overwhelming sentiment of the General Council and against them actively so far as I know, Dr. Matthews alone among the members of the Council. Let us so proceed and then at the meeting of the General Council at St. Paul on Wednesday, May 22nd, give such consideration as to procedure as the intervening time may make wise.

Yesterday I sent you two letters which I had received from Dr. Matthews and my replies. It is characteristic of him to feel aggrieved when his advice is not at once and wholeheartedly followed. Of course, he has the wrong viewpoint in this matter. He does not seem to understand the ideals which animated us and many others in this matter, nor does he seem to appreciate the relationship of the teaching of the Word of God to what we are endeavoring to further. I am increasingly convinced that we have on our side of this question all that could be desired in the way of scriptural and practical considerations. However, if a little patience can make our position stronger surely we ought to be willing to exercise this grace.

As to Miss Hodge's suggestion that we send a copy of the report of our Committee on the Status of Women and of the Council's action upon it to the fifteen representative women, will it not do to send them each a copy of the Blue Book when this is off the press with this section marked. This will save the work of mimeographing, especially, this report for this particular form of distribution.

Ever affectionately yours,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

March 19, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

RECEIVED
MAR 20 1929

Mr. Speer

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

I have your letter of March 18th re Dr. Mark Matthews and the proposed overture relating to the status of women. It seems to me that we should go straight ahead with our plans which have behind them the overwhelming sentiment of the General Council and against them actively so far as I know, Dr. Matthews alone among the members of the Council. Let us so proceed and then at the meeting of the General Council at St. Paul on Wednesday, May 22nd, give such consideration as to procedure as the intervening time may make wise.

Yesterday I sent you two letters which I had received from Dr. Matthews and my replies. It is characteristic of him to feel aggrieved when his advice is not at once and wholeheartedly followed. Of course, he has the wrong viewpoint in this matter. He does not seem to understand the ideals which animated us and many others in this matter, nor does he seem to appreciate the relationship of the teaching of the Word of God to what we are endeavoring to further. I am increasingly convinced that we have on our side of this question all that could be desired in the way of scriptural and practical considerations. However, if a little patience can make our position stronger surely we ought to be willing to exercise this grace.

As to Miss Hodge's suggestion that we send a copy of the report of our Committee on the Status of Women and of the Council's action upon it to the fifteen representative women, will it not do to send them each a copy of the Blue Book when this is off the press with this section marked. This will save the work of mimeographing, especially, this report for this particular form of distribution.

Ever affectionately yours,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

RECEIVED
MAR 2 3 1929
Mr. Speer

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

March 22, 1929.

RE

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

Enclosed please find a letter which I have just written to Dr. McEwan and which I am sharing with Dr. Laird and you. I am anxious at as early a moment as possible to be sure that nothing is left undone that can be done to secure the adoption by the Assembly of the report of the Directors, and therefore have written Dr. McEwan as above. Of course, I am willing to lend every possible help.

Ever affectionately yours,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

March 22, 1929.

Rev. William L. McEwan, D.D.,
906 S. Negley Ave.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

My dear Dr. McEwan:

I have just received your letter of March 20th. The Report of the Directors to the General Assembly is now in the hands of the printer and just as soon as proof is received and corrected, I will see that copies are available for the use of the Committee of the Directors appointed to prosecute this matter before the Assembly, namely, Dr. McEwan, Chairman, Drs. Laird and Speer.

Does it not seem to you that now is the time for me to step in the background and to permit the members of this Committee of which you are the Chairman to handle matters from now on. I wonder whether, now that the Group of Six has completed its work and my duties as Secretary are ended, it is advisable for me as Stated Clerk of the Assembly to conduct any correspondence with reference to the securing of signatures to the report of the Board of Directors in addition to those authorized at the meeting of the Directors by those who voted for the adoption of the Report of the Group of Six and for its transmission to the General Assembly as the report of the Board. I feel sure that you will not misunderstand my attitude. I am eager and willing to do all that I can with propriety. How does this matter appear to you. Would it not be better for Dr. Laird, Dr. Speer and you to get in personal touch with the few members of the Board of Directors who were not at the meeting of the Board on March 15th. These are the following:

Drs. Patton, Warfield, Maitland Alexander, Finney, Judge Bruce, Messrs. Marsh and Smith, or seven in all. At the meeting on March 15th the following voted for the report- Drs. McEwan, Laird, George Alexander, Mudge, Robinson, Radcliffe, Morgan, Speer, Brank, Hutchison, Nichols, J. R. Stevenson, Dickson, Manson (fourteen). The following voted in the negative - Drs. Macartney, Craig, Hodge, Bronson, F. Stevenson, Beach, Crane, Inglis and Burrell (nine).

My understanding of the result of our informal conference on the train was that you would assume all responsibility for all that was done to secure the signature of Dr. Patton. Dr. Speer would get in touch with Judge Bruce and Mr. Marsh and that Dr. Laird would get in touch with Dr. Maitland Alexander and Dr. Warfield

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

and Mr. J. Willison Smith. I agreed to get in touch with Dr. Finney which I will do.

With reference to the members of the Committee of Eleven, I am wondering whether it would not be well for Dr. Laird, Dr. Speer and yourself, who are now the official representatives of the Board of Directors in connection with the report to the General Assembly, to get into some sort of touch with Dr. Thompson and the other members of the Committee of Eleven. I shall be willing to help in any way I can, but as I have intimated above, it seems to me that the leadership should now be definitely in the hands of this Committee of Three, and that I and any others that have been closely associated with this matter should be kept in the background and leave to this Committee and uninterrupted opportunity to function.

Again let me emphasize my willingness to do all I can by way of co-operation. I am only trying to take the place which it seems to me I should occupy and to prevent all possible misunderstandings as to who is now in the place of leadership. The Group of Six is no more. The Committee of Three is to the fore. Said Committee of Three I shall be delighted to help to the utmost.

Please let me know your reaction to the above that we may have no possible misunderstandings and that the work yet to be done may be carried on with a full understanding as to just where responsibility lies. It has been such a joy to be associated with you in this very exacting experience and your devotion as Chairman has deepened our affection for you.

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

RECEIVED
MAR 25 1929

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

March 23, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dr. William L. McEwan,
Dr. Robert E. Speer,
Dr. John B. Laird,

Dear Brethren:

As you have been appointed by the Board of Directors to represent said Board before the General Assembly in connection with the report of the Directors which is to be submitted to the 1929 General Assembly, I enclose herewith a copy of a letter which I have this day addressed to the Rev. Sylvester W. Beach, D.D., Secretary of the Board of Directors.

With kind regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

L. S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

March 23, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Rev. Sylvester W. Beach, D.D.,
Princeton, N. J.

Dear Dr. Beach:

I have just received the minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors of March 15, 1929. I beg leave to bring to your attention again that the report of the Board of Directors to the next General Assembly therein contained is seriously incomplete. This report does not include the proposed Charter changes nor does it include the proposed new Plan. Both of these sections of the report of the Board of Directors are exceedingly important and the Minutes should certainly include them.

May I also bring your attention again to the fact that you have included in the Minutes something which was not adopted by the Board of Directors, namely, the substitute which was offered by Dr. Craig. On at least two occasions I have brought to your attention and to the attention of the Board, the fact that it is illegal as well as illogical to insert in the minutes of a body motions, or papers or reports not adopted. The records of a body should consist of the actions taken by the body and nothing else unless specifically ordered by the body.

Please do not misunderstand me, I have no objection whatever to having the substitute which is in these Minutes spread upon the Minutes if the Board of Directors so directs. It is in no way whatever to the contents of this substitute to which I am raising objection, it is the fact that the Minutes are made up of something which was not adopted by the Board and which therefore, unless the Board specifically directs should not be spread upon the Minutes. I exceedingly regret to be compelled to refer again to this matter. As Secretary of the Board of Directors, you should appreciate rather than in anyway resent my bringing to your attention what is a universal custom so far as I know with reference to the minutes of committees, boards and other bodies, namely, that the minutes unless otherwise specifically ordered by the body involved contain that which has been adopted by the body as the expression of its judgment or opinion or both and not what it has rejected or refused to

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

consider. Unless a secretary adheres to this policy, he gets into all sorts of trouble and brings the body of which he is secretary into inconsistencies.

Assuring you that the above is written only to assist you and not in anyway in unfriendly criticism, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

March 25, 1929.

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1929
Mr. Speer

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

Enclosed please find copy of a letter I have just written to Dr. McEwan also a copy of his letter to me.

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

March 25, 1929.

Rev. William L. McEwan, D.D.
906 S. Negley Ave.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

My dear Dr. McEwan:

I have your gracious note of March 23rd. I shall be glad indeed to do as you request and send a copy of the Report to the General Assembly to each of the members of the Board of Directors with the request of the Group that he authorise his signature thereto. It will be a real delight to do this and anything else I can do to further the interest in which we are so wholeheartedly united. May I not ask, however, whether you do not feel we are authorized to attach to our report as it appears in the Blue Book, the names of all those who voted for it at the last meeting of the Board of Directors? Will it be wise for us to raise with these fourteen persons the question as to whether their names are to be attached to the report? Have we not a right to assume this? Similarly with reference to the nine who voted against it, will it be tactful for us to press this matter of their signatures to this report? Are they not committed to signing the minority report if such is prepared or to withholding their signatures from any report? In other words is not our wise plan to concentrate our efforts upon the members of the Board whose names we divided among us on the train, namely, Drs. Patton, Warfield, Maitland Alexander, Finney, Judge Bruce, Messrs. Marsh and Smith. You see I want your wise guidance in this matter that Imay not injure rather than help our cause.

With sincere affection, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

(COPY)

THIRD PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
PITTSBURGH, Pa.

March 23, 1929

My dear Lew:

It seems to me that you would be concluding your work as Secretary of Group by sending the request signed by me as Chairman and you as Secretary with copy of report, (as suggested in form of letter we framed on train) to each of the members of the Board. This was the Group's request - I wrote Patton you would send report and formal request.

I quite understand that you do not wish to mix Stated Clerk's duties with Group affairs in any way that would look to the most critical as unwise - I will reply more carefully to your letter when I have time. This is in reference only to the particular question of finishing the Group's work, and more particularly to carry out my promises to Dr. Patton.

Humbly yours,

William L. McEwan (signed)

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

MAR 27 1929

March 26, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

In your letter dated March 25th you make some references to the Princeton matters. I am endeavoring to keep these matters from getting into more or less of a snarl and hence have not done some things which I suppose might have been done with a certain degree of propriety.

I believe that it is far better for someone person to handle the cases of the members of the Board of Directors who were not present at the last meeting of the Board rather than to have several approaching each such director. I am enclosing herewith to you two copies of the report in galley proof. I suggest that you use them in approaching Judge Bruce and Mr. Marsh. These proofs are accurate in all respects excepting that a few words of introduction were inadvertently omitted at the beginning of Article VI. We expect to have the report in page proof within a day or two. If you think it wise for me to write Judge Bruce and Mr. Marsh in addition to your approach, I shall be glad so to do.

Laird tells me that he feels assured of the signature of Mr. J. Willison Smith. I am writing to Dr. Finney today now that I have a copy of the report that I can send him. I will also write to Dr. Patton at Dr. McEwan's earnest request. Laird tells me that he is not having much success with Maitland Alexander but does not believe that he will sign the minority report. I will send Dr. McEwan a copy of the report in galley proof that he may send it to Dr. Warfield.

I had an extended conference this morning with Dr. Luccock and went over our report with him somewhat in detail. He seemed to be of the opinion that there would be little or no difficulty in getting the Committee of Eleven behind this report. I am increasingly of the opinion that sometime during April, perhaps late in the month, it would be well for Dr. McEwan, Laird and yourself to have a conference with the Committee of Eleven in meeting assembled.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

With reference to your suggestion relating to Judge Fox and the Board of Trustees, I will be glad to see that a copy of the report of the Board of Directors to the next General Assembly is available for every member of the Board of Trustees when and as Judge Fox and Laird may deem wise.

Ever affectionately yours,

L. S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

M Linn Bruce

RECEIVED
MAR 27 1929
Mr. Speer

M. LINN BRUCE
68 WILLIAM STREET
NEW YORK

March 26, 1929.

Rev. Robert E. Speer, D. D.
Board of Foreign Missions,
156-Fifth Ave.N.Y.City.

My dear Dr. Speer:

I have your letter of the 21st inst.

I joined in the Report of the Committee of Eleven made to the Assembly of 1928 and which will be before the Assembly of 1929.

I signed the Report under the conviction that it proposed the best solution of the difficulties at Princeton. Nothing which has happened since has changed my mind. While a majority of those present at the last meeting of the Board, adopted a Report which, if accepted by the Assembly will result in a single Board of Control and in other changes which may remedy the intolerable conditions now existing, I remain of the opinion that the plan of the Committee of Eleven is the better plan and one which I think will work with the least friction.

I feel therefore that I would be open to the charge of inconsistency or at least of indecision if I were to sign the Report of the Board of Directors.

Cordially yours,

M Linn Bruce

Copy

M. LINN BRUCE
68 William Street
New York

March 26, 1929.

Rev. Robert E. Speer, D. D.

Board of Foreign Missions,

156-Fifth Ave., N.Y.City.

My dear Dr. Speer:

I have your letter of the 21st inst.

I joined in the Report of the Committee of Eleven made to the Assembly of 1928 and which will be before the Assembly of 1929.

I signed the Report under the conviction that it proposed the best solution of the difficulties at Princeton. Nothing which has happened since has changed my mind. While a majority of those present at the last meeting of the Board, adopted a Report which, if accepted by the Assembly will result in a single Board of Control and in other changes which may remedy the intolerable conditions now existing, I remain of the opinion that the plan of the Committee of Eleven is the better plan and one which I think will work with the least friction.

I feel therefore that I would be open to the charge of inconsistency or at least of indecision if I were to sign the Report of the Board of Directors.

Cordially yours,

(signed) M. Linn Bruce

Copy

M. LINN BRUCE
68 William Street
New York

March 26, 1929.

Rev. Robert E. Speer, D. D.

Board of Foreign Missions,

156-Fifth Ave., N.Y.City.

My dear Dr. Speer:

I have your letter of the 21st inst.

I joined in the Report of the Committee of Eleven made to the Assembly of 1928 and which will be before the Assembly of 1929.

I signed the Report under the conviction that it proposed the best solution of the difficulties at Princeton. Nothing which has happened since has changed my mind. While a majority of those present at the last meeting of the Board, adopted a Report which, if accepted by the Assembly will result in a single Board of Control and in other changes which may remedy the intolerable conditions now existing, I remain of the opinion that the plan of the Committee of Eleven is the better plan and one which I think will work with the least friction.

I feel therefore that I would be open to the charge of inconsistency or at least of indecision if I were to sign the Report of the Board of Directors.

Cordially yours,

(signed) M. Linn Bruce

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

March 28, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

3 0 1929

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE GROUP OF SIX.

Dear Brethren:

I am transmitting to you herewith the Minutes of Group Conference No. 12. I trust that you will forward to me any suggestions as to corrections or additions even though the Group has adjourned sine die. It will be well to have our records accurate up to the end of our work.

May I take this opportunity of saying that I shall always look back upon my association with the members of the Group of Six as among the pleasantest of my life and shall always be grateful that I had the privilege of being closely related to so important a task.

With affectionate regards, believe me

Fraternally yours,

L. S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Group Secretary

Wm L. McEwan

Third Presbyterian Church
Pittsburgh, Pa.

MAR 30 1929

March 28, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City, N. Y.

My Dear Robert:

I wrote a letter to Dr. Patton requesting him to sign our report and announcing that Dr. Mudge would send him a formal request from the Group and a copy of the report. This morning Dr. Mudge sent me a copy of the letter he had written Dr. Patton and it was a very beautiful letter. My understanding of what we thought ought to be done was that Dr. Mudge would send a brief letter signed by me as Chairman and himself as Secretary of the Group, which should simply be a formal and impersonal presentation of the opportunity to sign the report, if those who received the report desired so to do. Further than this, certain members of the Board were to be addressed by some member of the Group. You were to have Judge Bruce and Mr. Marsh. Laird was to have Dr. Warfield and others. The only name given to me was that of Dr. Patton. Dr. Mudge writes me that he had seen Dr. Luccock and that Dr. Luccock expressed himself as favorable to our report. It would add immensely to our probability of having our report approved by the Assembly to have the Committee of Eleven endorse it and withdraw theirs. It would lessen the likelihood of the adoption of the Report of the Committee of Eleven by reason of Dr. Craig's Minority Report. I do not believe for an instant that his report could be adopted, but it might produce the effect upon the Assembly that the Board of Directors was so hopelessly divided that it would be wise to adopt Dr. Thompson's Report. It will be necessary for us to know what action the Board of Trustees took as their final position before we can hope for the approval of members of the Committee of Eleven. The Board of Trustees were much closer to that Committee than the Board of Directors. They may be able to cause the Committee of Eleven to refuse to endorse our report. I believe our report is the fairest one that could be made under the circumstances and I do not fear what such a united Board would do. So long as the preparation of our report rested as a responsibility on us, I felt the weight greatly. Since we have done the best we knew how, I am not troubled as to what will become of our report. I want it presented to the Assembly in the best and most impressive way and then the responsibility belongs to the Assembly. While I appreciate the spirit and the services in which all the members of the Group had part, I feel a peculiar gratitude to Dr. Mudge for all that he was able to do in the furtherance of our efforts. I am glad our Group does not need to meet again as with the General Assembly and the anniversary of my pastorate and two baccalaureate sermons and the dedication of a church in a Southern state and the communion season immediately following, I have all that I care to anticipate. Later on we will confer about the wisdom of meeting the whole or part of the Committee of Eleven.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl

REPORT OF THE GROUP OF SIX TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Group of Six would respectfully submit the following to the Board of Directors as worthy of consideration as the report of the Board to the 1929 General Assembly.

TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
IN THE U.S.A. IN SESSION AT ST. PAUL, MINN., MAY, 1929.

Dear Brethren:

The Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton, N.J., would respectfully submit the following report:

The General Assembly in session at Tulsa in May, 1928, having received Majority and Minority Reports from its Special Committee, authorized and provided for by action of the General Assembly at San Francisco, May 1927, and having given due consideration to the same, ordered that said Majority and Minority Reports be placed on the docket of the General Assembly of 1929 for consideration by that Assembly and adopted the following resolution proposed by the Rev. Mark A. Matthews, D.D., as a substitute for the two preceding motions, namely, the motion to adopt the report of the majority, and the motion to substitute the minority report therefor:

"Whereas, the Majority and Minority Reports from the Special Committee of Eleven on Princeton Theological Seminary, if adopted or rejected, leave the situation at Princeton Seminary in an unsettled state, therefore be it resolved, that the further consideration of said Reports be postponed for one year, and that the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary be and hereby is instructed to proceed immediately to compose the differences at the Seminary and to make a full report on these instructions to the next General Assembly." (See Minutes 1928, Part I, p.59.)

On June 20, 1928, the Board of Directors of Princeton Theological Seminary met in formal session to receive the instructions of the General Assembly as embodied in this resolution and to take suitable action thereupon. The Directors at once appointed a "Group of Six" who were "asked to confer together and report as soon as possible to this meeting a form of procedure and such action as they may deem proper and expedient under the action of the General Assembly just communicated to us." Including the meeting just referred to the Board of Directors has, in an endeavor to "proceed immediately to compose the differences in the Seminary" held meetings. The "Group of Six" which was continued has, in addition, held meetings.

This "Group of Six" has also under instructions from the Board of Directors held three conferences with the Conference Committee of the Board of Trustees and has on two occasions appeared before the Board of Trustees. The Group has also by direction of the Board of Directors had one conference with the Faculty of the Seminary in meeting assembled and has been in frequent touch with all members of the Faculty through written communications.

accomplish as the was directed always

The Board of Directors begs leave, therefore, to report that no endeavor has been spared by the Board and by its representatives to obey in spirit and in letter the instructions of the General Assembly. It is with deep regret that the Board of Directors must report that they have been unable to ~~compose the differences at the Seminary~~ in ~~all respects~~ in the time allotted to them for this task. Differences which are the growth of years and to which men of great ability and intense convictions are related cannot ~~often~~ be adjusted in a twelve month. The Directors, however, believe that progress has been made toward composing the differences of the Seminary since the General Assembly was last in session, and are of the opinion that with time and patience and the cooperation which may be confidently expected if the approval of the General Assembly may be obtained for the same, the following procedure will be found effective in securing the results which not only the General Assembly but all who seek the honor of religion will earnestly desire.

To compose the differences at Princeton Theological Seminary, we recommend -

1. That the proposed new Board of Trustees of the Seminary shall be composed of the members of the present Boards of Directors and Trustees.

immediately

2. That prior to the organization of the new Board of Trustees as above constituted, all officers of ~~both~~ the ~~now~~ existing Boards shall resign and at the initial election shall not accept election to the corresponding office in the new Board. Furthermore, that all Committees of the ~~now~~ existing Boards, Standing and Special, shall terminate their services when the new Board is constituted, and that no one of the Chairmen of said Committees shall be appointed Chairman of the corresponding Committee in the new Board.

3. That the present Seminary Administration and Faculty shall be continued subject to such action as the new Board of Trustees, when organized, may after full consideration ultimately deem it wise to take.

4. That the proposed new plan as contained in the majority report of the General Assembly's Committee with certain amendments herewith submitted, be the Plan of the Seminary.

5. That the existing Board of Trustees of the Seminary in cooperation with the Directors, be and hereby are directed to proceed at once (a) to determine the legal course of procedure necessary to secure such Charter changes as will make possible a new Board of Trustees constituted of the present Boards of Trustees and Directors; (b) to procure such Charter changes in such way as the laws of the State of New Jersey may require and in such way as shall protect and secure the rights in the Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; and (c) to elect to membership in the new Board of Trustees the members of the present Board of Directors.

hope

It is the ~~judgment~~ of the Board of Directors that the above Plan if given the approval of the General Assembly will "compose the differences at the Seminary" and for the following reasons:

1. If reorganization is necessary to compose these differences the plan above proposed provides for reorganization. It includes an amended Charter, a practically new "Plan", and provides for an entire change in leadership so far as Board officers and committee chairmen are concerned.

2. If continuance of the traditions of the Seminary and its associations with the past are sought, these are secured in that the personnel of the new governing body is in no wise changed from the personnel of the existing Boards.

3. If the differences of opinion now existing between the Board of Directors and the Board of Trustees as to limits of jurisdiction are emphasized, these will be eliminated at once and for all time by the establishment of one governing Board composed of the two existing Boards.

4. If there are differences in the Faculty which must be composed, this plan provides for such composition not by the issuance of edicts, but by the exercise of Christian patience, tact and consideration under the guidance authority of a Board the members of which have been in personal touch with, and are thoroughly familiar with, the immediate and more remote past.

5. If it is deemed that the present administration of the Seminary in the persons of the President and the Faculty should be given a fair opportunity to function under a new "Plan" before judgment is passed as to what changed in personnel, if any, may be ultimately required for the obtaining of peace and progress, said plan provides for such a period of service by the President and Faculty.

6. If it is asserted that other suggested plans will lead to unfriendly litigation in the civil courts with consequent results which will greatly imperil the usefulness and prestige of the Seminary, this plan reduces toa minimum the possibility of such a greatly to be regretted outcome.

7. If a plan is sought which will command the assent of the greatest number possible of the members of the two existing Boards, no plan has yet been suggested which has received the approval of as many of the Directors and Trustees as does this plan. Of 31 Directors . . . have given it approval, and of . . . Trustees .. . . have given it approval. Or out of a possible . . . Directors and Trustees . . . . have given it approval.

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

April 1, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE GROUP OF SIX.

Dear Brethren:

Permit me to say that Dr. Craig has just filed with me a Minority Report which is signed by the nine members of the Board of Directors who voted against our Report at the last meeting of the Board of Directors, and by Dr. Alexander making ten in all.

With reference to the signatures to our report, Mr. J. Willison Smith and Dr. John M. T. Finney have authorized their signatures, making sixteen to-date. My impression is that Dr. Warfield will not sign either report. Judge Bruce through Dr. Speer has indicated that being a member of the Committee of Eleven he prefers not to sign our report. I am hoping that Mr. Marsh will authorize his signature and we will secure for our report the signature of Dr. Patton. If so, we will have practically two-thirds of the Board on the side of our report.

Yours sincerely,

L. S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

APR 3 - 1929

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

April 2, 1929. 69

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

This morning I had an extended telephone conversation with John McDowell. Following it I tried to get you on the telephone but found that you would not be in your office until tomorrow. Enclosed please find copy of a letter which I have just written John McDowell and which covers the maing points of our telephone conversation. He is intending to see you in the near future.

Ever affectionately yours,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

April 2, 1929.

Rev. John McDowell, D.D.,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear John:

Referring to our telephone conversation of this morning, permit me to say, first, that as acting in my capacity as Stated Clerk of the Assembly I shall, of course, be more than willing to hold open the pages of the Blue Book just as long as I possibly can that its contents may be as accurate as possible. With reference to the specific matter relating to the contents of the Blue Book concerning which we were speaking this morning, reason 7, top of p. 4, page proof Directors report to the General Assembly, permit me to say that the Group of Six intended to have inserted in this reason 7, and so informed the Directors when the Directors adopted this reason 7, in blank, the total number of Directors and total number of Trustees, who have given their approval to the report of the Board of Directors as inserted in the Blue Book. We did not intend to place in this No.7 the vote of the Board of Directors at the meeting when the report of the Directors to the General Assembly was adopted. We intended to place in this No. 7 the total number of Directors who agreed to sign the report just as the minority are dealing with their report.

We expected also that the Committee of the Board of Directors in charge presenting the report to the General Assembly, namely, Drs. McEwan, Speer and Laird, would ascertain how many of the Trustees were willing to give their approval to the report of the Board of Directors to the General Assembly and insert said number. It would seem to me that this is the plain intent of No. 7 as it now stands in blank. Furthermore, it seems to me that this is information which the General Assembly has a right to have and which both the Board of Directors as a whole and the Board of Trustees as a whole ought to be glad for the Assembly to have.

As I informed you over the telephone the Group of Six has gone its way, having been disbanded at the meeting of the Board

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

of Directors on March 15th. Any pending matters are now in the hands of Drs. McEwan, Speer and Laird the Committee above referred to.. However, I am still ready and willing to be of any service I can in connection with these Princeton matters.

With kind regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

April 2, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dr. W. L. McEwan,
Dr. Robert E. Speer,
Dr. John B. Laird:

Dear Brethren:

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter received today from Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, also a copy of my reply.

With kind regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

April 2, 1929.

Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D.,
Princeton, N. J.

My dear Dr. Stevenson:

I have your letter of April 1st with reference to matters relating to Princeton Theological Seminary and particularly in this connection with reference to the report of the Board of Directors as adopted by said Board for presentation to the next General Assembly. It is very difficult to write clearly upon so involved a subject as that included in your letter, but I shall do my best.

First, please be so kind as to think of me for the time being as I write as Stated Clerk of the General Assembly. The Secretary of the Board of Trustees consulted me with reference to the insertion in the Blue Book of a report, or statement or other document, by the Board of Trustees of the Seminary. I told him that I did not see how as Stated Clerk I could admit to the Blue Book such a document. The purpose for which the Blue Book is printed is perfectly clear. It is defined in Standing Rule 29, see 1928 Minutes, Part I, p.572-22. As the Board of Trustees is not related to the General Assembly in any way that I know of corresponding to the status of a "Special or other Committee", it did not seem to me that I could place in the Blue Book any document from this source. On my own motion, however, I suggested to Dr. McDowell that if the Board of Trustees wished to communicate with the General Assembly in the premises, a memorial addressed to the General Assembly could and would so far as I was concerned be printed in the official Bulletin. I cannot see how this would tend to emphasize any existing differences of opinion between the Directors and the Trustees, unless somebody took the trouble to draw a totally unwarranted contrast between the place in which the report of the Directors appeared, namely, the Blue Book and the place in which a memorial from the Trustees appeared, namely, the official Bulletin.

As to the other matters referred to in your letter, I am of course, writing as a member of the Group of Six. My understanding of the use to which Section 7 in the report of the Board of Directors to the General Assembly is to be put, see page proof top of page 4, is to record the [illegible] of the Boards

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

of Directors and Trustees who may ultimately give their approval to the report of the Board of Directors as included in the Blue Book just as it is there printed without further conditions and reservations. It is not for the purpose of recording the vote of the Board of Directors on this report on March 15th last, nor is it for the purpose of recording the vote that the Trustees may take upon this report at some future meeting. It seemed to the Group of Six and the Board of Directors in adopting the report of the Group of Six that it was perfectly fair and straightforward procedure for us to report to the General Assembly just how many Directors and just how many Trustees were willing to give unqualified approval to the report of the Board of Directors to the Assembly. Why should not this be known?

With reference to your rather sharp criticism of the delay in the reception by the Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the report of the Board of Directors to the Assembly, permit me to say that out of the kindness of my heart I went to the help of Dr. Beach and di my utmost with the resources of the Office of the General Assembly behind me to put the report of the Board in proper shape for the printer, checking over most carefully every detail, reading the report in galley proof and seeing that it was placed in temporary page proof. May I assure you that not an hour was lost that I could command in this connection. I wonder just what the situation would be to-day in this matter, if Dr. Beach, with the infirmities of old age upon him, had been allowed to go his own way.

May I also remind you in this connection that the Board of Trustees at its meeting on March 14th heard read in full the report of the Board of Directors adopted the next day for transmission to the General Assembly, excepting the suggested charter amendments and the plan which were placed in the hands of the Board of Trustees by me in writing at said meeting of the Trustees.

I trust that I may be pardoned to add that the Group of Six went out of its way to be courteous to and patient with both the Board of Trustees and its Conference Committee. Personally I visited Mr. Synnott in his office several times and Dr. John McDowell in his office and explained to them just what our ideas and ideals were and just what moves we were making and why. So

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

far as I know there is no intent whatever on the part of the Board of Directors to ignore the Board of Trustees now. Matters relating to the Board of Directors andthe Assembly are no longer in the hands of the Group of Six, which has been disbanded by order of the Directors. They are in the hands of a Committee of the Board of Directors consisting of Drs. McEwan, Speer and Laird. Permit me to assure you in conclusion that I continue to be ready to do anything I can to bring the Princeton difficulties to as favorable a solutionas is possible under the circumstances.

With kind personal regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

COPY

April 1,1929

Dear Dr. Mudge:

You may recall that in a recent conversation over the telephone I inquired whether any action of the Trustees taken in the near future could be included in the report of the Board of Directors and printed in the Blue Book. My reason for making this inquiry was a desire on my part to have the Trustees meet as promptly as possible so that the Group of Six might have in hand a report of the action desired and which is contemplated in munber seven of the reasons presented to the Board of Directors as a part of the report of the Group of Six.

I was, therefore, surprised to learn through Dr. Mc Dowell that it is not necessary to call a special meeting of the Board of Trustees because of information received from you to the effect that since the Board of Trustees does not in any sense occupy the status of a special committee of the General Assembly, any report it may make in answer to overtures from the Board of Directors ipso facto cannot be included in the Blue Book. Perhaps you meant by this that it will not be in order to publish in the Blue Book an independent report from the Trustees. But it seems to me that the report of the Group of Six as approved by the Board of Directors not only assumes concurrence on the part of the Board of Trustees but specifically implies that the Board of Trustees has been consulted and that of the total number of the Trustees so many have given their approval of the Director's plan. While the report as such contemplates only the number of Trustees who have given their approval, if this approval, as hitherto, has conditions implied, it would seem to me that the Directors are under obligations to specify what these conditions are. To send the report in in its present form seems to me very incomplete. The fifth recommendation asking the General Assembly to direct the Trustees to proceed at once, etc., will seem to the General Assembly a rather high-handed move on the part of the Directors unless it can be shown that the Trustees have been consulted and have given their assent. To publish in the Blue Book the seventh reason in favor of the plan of the Group of Six just as it is will certainly be misleading. Those who read the Blue Book will infer that not only a majority of the Board of Directors but a majority of the Board of Trustees are in favor of this plan and that without any conditions. I earnestly hoped that immediately following the meeting of the Board of Directors there

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

would be held the deferred meeting of the Board of Trustees and I had high hopes that a majority of the Trustees would unito with the majority of the Directors, but the failure of the Directors to send promptly their action to the Secretary of the Board of Trustees, the intimation now that any action they may take will not be incorporated in the Blue Book, will I fear only widen the breach and expose a majority of the Directors not only to the stubborn opposition of the minority in the Board, but to the refusal of the Trustees to concur. Frankly, it seems very strange that following all the endeavors to persuade the Trustees to come over to the position of the Group of Six, the policy now seems to be to drop the Trustees entirely since they are not likely to be useful for the particular purpose had in mind. I understand that it will be possible for the Trustees to incorporate any report they may wish to make in the Official Bulletin. Such a publication will naturally accentuate the fact that there is an open breach between the Directors and the Trustees, and that it is impossible for them to come together.

Very cordially and sincerely yours,

J. ROSS STEVENSON

The Rev. Lewis S. Mudge, D.D., LL.D.,
Philadelphia,Pa.

Wm L. McEwan

Third Presbyterian Church
Pittsburgh, Pa.

APR 3 - 1929

April 2, 1929.

S

Dr. Robert E. Speer
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City, N. Y.

My Dear Robert:

Dr. Patton declines to sign our report, but says he will not sign the Minority Report. It is more than probable, though not certain, that I shall run down to Bermuda for a week or ten days, and if I do, I will leave next Monday. A friend who is expecting to go at that time has invited me to accompany him and I think the only question is whether I can obtain reservations going and coming at this time. Of course, my visit to Dr. Patton would not affect his decision to refrain from signing our report. He seems to me to approve of it in the main, but feels that it would be a very heavy blow to the men on the Faculty with whom he has been associated as colleagues if he should sign a report that they oppose so strenuously. I really have promised to do more in the next two months than any ordinary man should attempt.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl

Lewis S Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dear Bobby,

It seems to me that Drs McEwen, Lamb & you might well be making some definite plans to ascertain who of the Board of Trustees is willing to be including among those who may be counted in "Reason 7" top of page four page proof Report of Directors to the G.A. Evidently McDowell et al are desirous of making this summary a summary by votes in Board meetings assembled i.e. the Board of Directors to credit 14 (because of vote March 15 of 14-9) as in favor of report. Over the 'phone McDowell said that the last vote we could record in this "Reason 7" was the vote of the Trustees in January last i.e. 2-11 — as far as the Trustees were concerned.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

I shall be glad to be of any possible service in rounding up the Trustees but of course the "Group of Six" is out of calculation. Your committee (Dr McE. Dr I. & Dr S) are now in leadership. Dr McE. will not move fast enough if he is left alone. He has not the strength. Outside meetings of the "Group" I did practically all his work as chairman for him. If had as to do, the things would not have moved

Yours affectionately
Lewis S. Mudge

April 2, 1929

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

RECEIVED
APR 5 1929

April 5, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

69

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

I have just received the enclosed letter from Dr. Stevenson in reply to mine to him, a copy of which I have forwarded to you. When you have read Dr. Stevenson's letter, will you kindly return it. Do you feel that my judgment is right when I think that this letter of April 4th requires no reply from me? I do not wish to get into a correspondence which will be interminable if one begins to discuss all these various issues.

Ever affectionately yours,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S ROOM

April 4, 1929.

Dear Dr. Mudge:-

Your letter of April 2nd has been received and read with deepest interest.

First, let me say that it was fartherest from my thought to indulge in any "sharp criticism". I realize how complicated the affairs of Princeton Seminary have become and how difficult it is to keep everything straightened out in connection with frequent Board and committee meetings. I do not question for an instant the position you take as Stated Clerk.

Naturally, any action of the Board of Trustees has no place in the Blue Book except as it may be linked up with items incorporated in the report of the Directors. Should this report make no allusion to the Trustees, the case would be very simple, but as I understand the report, it claims to reflect the mind of the Trustees. It is certainly in order for the Trustees, therefore, to state whether their position is accurately represented and to urgently request either that no reference at all be made to the Trustees, or, if made, it should accurately and adequately represent their frame of mind. You are quite right in stating that the report of the Group was presented in advance to the Board of Trustees but you seem to overlook the fact that having heard this report, the Board of Trustees unanimously, and, if I mistake not at the suggestion of Judge Fox, voted to defer consideration of this report pending the action of the Board of Directors. Such action certainly cannot be interpreted as giving individual Trustees liberty to repond to any personal appeals and indicate whether they are for or against the report of the Directors. As I understand it, it is not usual for any body to record the votes of absentees, and therefore request was made of the Board of Directors to include in the majority report the names of absentees who might be willing to sign the report. If I mistake not, the minority asked for the same privilege. This certainly cannot be interpreted as an authorization for any Director or group of Directors to solicit the signatures of Trustees prior to the official action of that body.

Word has just come that the Trustees are to have a special meeting on April the 12th, at which time the majority report of the Directors will no doubt be given careful and friendly consideration. Thus far the Trustees have taken the position that in line with the action of the General Assembly which stated that the adoption of the majority or minority report of the Committee of Eleven would leave the situation at Princeton in an unsettled state, the Directors obligated themselves to "compose differences" and put an end to this unsettled state. Whether the Trustees will agree that action on the part of the Board of Directors which indicates a serious line

cleavage will ensure a settled state for Princeton, is a question concerning which there may be honest differences of opinion. Personally, I would deplore a continuance of such scenes as we witnessed at the last meeting of the Board of Directors when a proposition honestly and faithfully put forward was declared to be 'not only"wicked" but"damnable."

Very cordially and sincerely yours,

J. Ross Stevenson

The Rev. Lewis S. Mudge, D.D., LL.D.,

Philadelphia, Pa.

PATRONS ARE REQUESTED TO FAVOR THE COMPANY BY CRITICISM AND SUGGESTION CONCERNING ITS SERVICE

1201 S

CLASS OF SERVICE

This is a full-rate Telegram or Cablegram unless its deferred character is indicated by a suitable sign above or preceding the address.

RECEIVED APR 8 - 1929 Mr. Speer

WESTERN UNION

NEWCOMB CARLTON, PRESIDENT — J. C. WILLEVER, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

SIGNS

DL = Day Letter
NM = Night Message
NL = Night Letter
LCO = Deferred Cable
NLT = Cable Letter
WLT = Week-End Letter

The filing time as shown in the date line on full-rate telegrams and day letters, and the time of receipt at destination as shown on all messages, is STANDARD TIME.

Received at Flatiron Bldg., New York City

1929 APR 6 PM 12 47

PA26 16=WO PHILADELPHIA PENN 6 1233P

DR ROBERT E SPEER=

156 FIFTH AVE NEWYORK NY=

HAVE YOU HEARD ANYTHING FROM MR MARSH WITH REFERENCE TO SUPPORTING DIRECTORS REPORT TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY==

LEWIS S MUDGE.

THE QUICKEST, SUREST AND SAFEST WAY TO SEND MONEY IS BY TELEGRAPH OR CABLE

Edward J Fox

LAW OFFICES
FOX AND FOX
308-311 EASTON TRUST COMPANY BUILDING
EASTON, PA.

EDWARD J. FOX
EDWARD J. FOX, JR.

JAMES W. FOX
1896-1924

April 13th, 1939.

My dear Dr. Speer:

I am obliged to you for your courtesy in sending me the report of the Directors of the Seminary and the information in your letter. The Board of Trustees held a two hour meeting yesterday and there was the usual discussion. The Conference Committee gave a lengthy report some of which was quite, as I said in debate, in the style of the editorials in the Presbyterian, and the worst passage was eliminated after a debate. Dr. Morgan offered a resolution that the Board of Trustees would approve of either the report of the Directors or the report of the Committee of Eleven as the Assembly might determine. This was so inconsistent with the language of the report of the Conference Committee that it was finally decided to postpone action until the regular meeting of the Board on May 14th and that in the meantime the Conference Committee with Dr. Morgan should endeavor to make his suggestion germane to the body of the report. This I fancy will be a difficult task.

The majority of the Board show no disposition to relax their hostility to the Board of Directors. In the discussion I said that I was inclined to believe that the opinion of the Attorney General Katzenbach was probably the correct view of the law. Dr. McDowell paid his "disrepects" to me and said that I had misled the Committee of Eleven and the Assembly

FOX AND FOX

April 13th, 1929

Reverend Dr. Robert E. Speer.

because I had relied on the opinion of Mr. McCarter. He dominates the situation in the Board of Trustees and is the most serious obstacle to the possibility of an amicable adjustment of this matter. It is probable that I will not be able to attend the regular meeting of the Board but they are so determined to carry through their plan that I think it is a little moment whether those who are opposed are present or not.

I am, with much regard,

Yours sincerely,

Edward Fox

Reverend Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York, N.Y.

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

April 18, 1929.

Dr. William L. McEwan,
Dr. Robert E. Speer,
Dr. John B. Laird.

Dear Brethren:

A letter just received from Dr. Thompson states after a preamble relating to his endeavors to obtain a meeting of the Committee of Eleven and the obstacles he has encountered:

"Under the circumstances the most practicable thing seems to be to call a meeting for May 2nd and hold over for the 3rd. This will enable President Herrick and Judge Fox each to be present at one session. We might secure the attendance of Judge Bruce but certainly not of Mr. Bradley."

I am forarding this as doubtless representing the Directors you may wish to attend this meeting of the General Assembly's Committee on Princeton Theological Seminary.

With kind regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

L. S. Mudge
Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Where?

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

April 19, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

John McDowell was in my office yesterday afternoon and talked at considerable length about the Princeton situation. I do not know what moved him to come and see me unless he was anxious to make it clear that our friendly relationships had not been disturbed by any of our differences of opinions in connection with the Seminary. He referred several times in the conversation to the fact that differences of opinion if conscientious ought not to alter friendly relationships. To all such statements, of course, I responded cordially. I did my best to allow him to do the talking and to speak myself only when it was necessary to keep the conversation in pleasant and profitable flow. The reason I am writing to you with reference to his coming to my office is that if I understood him right he is strongly inclined to support the following propositions by way of adjustment:

I. That there be a single Board of control, composed of 33 members all of whom shall be selected from the present Directors and present Trustees. The selection is to be made by the General Assembly's Committee of Eleven, but with the distinct purpose in mind of leaving off the new Board all who have been extremists. As applied to the Board of Directors, I gather that this would in his judgment render ineligible for membership those who have signed the minority report of the Directors.

II. He expressed himself as greatly disturbed at what he criticizes as the change of front of Judge Fox with reference to the legal steps necessary to secure charter changes. He states that he thought Judge Fox was in hearty sympathy with the McCarter viewpoint. He finds that he is not satisfied with the McCarter opinion and perhaps never has been wholeheartedly so. Dr. McDowell is apparently in sympathy with the recommendations with reference to the securing of legal changes embodied in our report to the Assembly.

I am wondering, therefore, whether a compromise might not

ultimately be reached through the good offices of the Committee of Eleven, between the Committee of Eleven, the majority of the Board of Directors and the Board of Trustees and somewhat to the following effect:

I. The adoption of the report of the Directors to the next General Assembly as the basis of the compromise report.

II. The above mentioned report to be modified in two particulars:

(a) P. 2 Section 1 of the "Recommendations" to read "That there shall be a new Board of Trustees in place of the present Boards of Directors and Trustees. Said Board shall be composed of 33 members all of whom shall be selected from the present Boards of Directors and Trustees. Said selection shall be made by the General Assembly's Committee on Princeton Theologcial Seminary. There now being 30 Directors and 20 Trustees selection shall be made from the present Boards of Directors and Trustees in the ratio approximately of three to two."

(b) Report of the Directors to the General Assembly, p. 4 alter Amendments Section 1, to read:

"The Board of Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America at Princeton in the State of New Jersey, shall consist of thirty-three persons who shall be either ministers or ruling elders of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, not less than three of whom shall be citizens and residents of the State of New Jersey. Of these not more than two thirds shall be ministers, and not more than one third shall be ruling elders of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, provided that nothing contained herein shall render any persons members of the present Boards ineligible. After the first election and qualification of the said Trustees, it shall be by lot determined which of the number shall serve for three years. which for two years, and which for one year, and thereafter the Trustees at their annual meeting shall elect successors to those whose terms shall have expired or shall expire. Such election shall not be effective until approved by the General Assembly. The foregoing shall apply to all elections of Trustees, subsequent to the first election after the passage of this resolution. At the first

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

election after the adoption of this amendment, the members of the new Board shall all be members of the present Board of Trustees or of the present Board of Directors."

I wonder how the above suggestions strike you? Just how Dr. McEwan and Dr. Laird would view them I hardly know. Of course the principle to which they have assented, namely, that there shall be one Board of control and that said one Board shall initially be composed of members of the present Boards of Directors and Trustees, will be maintained. Of course no longer will it be true that all of the memebers of the ~~on~~ the two existing Boards will enter the membership of the new Board. How Dr. McEwan and Dr. Laird would feel about this I cannot say. I wonder whether they would not feel themselves warranted in the great emergency which faces the Seminary to consider themselves freed from all obligations to those who have not only bitterly attached them personally, but have signed a minority report for transmission to the General Assembly, when the majority report had been prepared by a Group of Six appointed as a body to seek honorable compromise. It seems to me to be somewhat unusual for a considerable minority of a body to insist upon submitting a minority report when the majority report is a report prepared by a Group in the selection of which they had as a large a part as anyone else. Let me hear from you at your convenience.

I note upon further review of our report to the General Assembly that one additional change ought to be made therein, see p. 3, end of first paragraph-"and (c) before going out of existence to elect to membership in the new Board of Trustees the members of the present Boards of Directors and of Trustees nominated by the Assembly's Committee and approved by the Assembly."

Ever affectionately yours,

L. S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

April 25, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

I have your letter of April 24th and its enclosures for all of which I thank you warmly. The position you take in the first paragraph of your letter I agree with entirely. You and I are not free to suggest a compromise as between the plan of the Directors and the plan of the Assembly's Committee. Certainly, however, as you intimate Dr. McEwan and Dr. Laird are free to suggest such a compromise, and I wish with you that they might sit down with Dr. Thompson and Dr. Luccock and also with Dr. McDowell and Dr. Morgan and adjust possible adjustments.

I have already written to Drs. McEwan and Laird fully with reference to my conference with John McDowell. I have also written Dr. McEwan doing my best to bring him up-to-date from my viewpoint.

I will, as you suggest, write to Minot Morgan. Although as you have had a conversation with him over the telephone, I do not know what there is for me to add. I am enclosing a copy of the letter I am writing to Minot Morgan.

Ever affectionately yours,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

April 25, 1929.

Rev. Minot C. Morgan, D.D.,
1111 Park Ave.,
New York City.

Dear Dr. Morgan:

I have just received a letter from Dr. Robert E. Speer in which he suggests that I write you with reference to such matters as might be of help to you as you meet with the Conference Committee of the Trustees next Monday in Princeton. As. Dr. Speer has conferred with you over the telephone, I hardly know what I can add. In Dr. Speer's letter to me occurs the following paragraph:

"Your letter of April 18th with reference to your interview with John McDowell has been received. As I said to you when you were here last week and as we told Dr. Craig plainly in the recent Directors meetings, the unwillingness of the minority of the Directors to join in the plan which the group recommended has increased the possibility of the adoption of the Thompson report, or of a compromise between it and the Directors plan, but you and I are not free to suggest such a compromise: We must loyally support Dr. McEwan and Dr. Laird and the plan which the majority of the Directors have accepted. I think, however, that Dr. McEwan and Dr. Laird are entirely free to suggest a compromise and I wish that Dr. McEwan could sit down with Dr. Thompson and Dr. Lucock on the one hand and talk everything over with them, and then on the other hand could sit with John McDowell and Minot Morgan and talk over with them the question of some adjustment with the majority of the Trustees."

This paragraph states the situation as I see it. However, perhaps it is not improper for me to indicate what would seem to me a possible line of compromise; at least, the only line of compromise which opens up to my vision as I write.

I would suggest as worthy of consideration the adoption of the report of the Directors to the General Assembly with the following modification, which modification would, of course, make necessary some minor changes - That the new Board of Trustees shall consist of from 30 to 35 members (it seems to

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

me that the number ought not to be less than 30 and might well be 35 members) all to be members of the present governing bodies. Said members to be nominated to the General Assembly by the General Assembly's Committee. As there are at present 30 Directors and 20 Trustees, I would suggest that selection be made from the two Boards in the ratio of three to two. That is to say if the new Board is composed of 35 members 21 of them should be elected from the present Board of Directors and 14 from the present Board of Trustees. Such a plan would make it possible to meet the objections of a considerable number of Dr. Thompson's Committee and of a considerable number of Trustees to placing on the new Board of of Trustees men whom they characterize as "irreconcilables". Not counting duplications there are at present 47 members of the two governing Boards. It ought not to be difficult to select 35 men out of those 47 who would represent fully the best traditions of Princeton Seminary and at the same time be free in any acute form of the bitternesses of the past.

May I be permitted to add that whatever may be the ultimate decision of the Board of Trustees as to a communication to the General Assembly, I most earnestly hope that it will not include the arraignment of any group or any individual. It is so easy to indulge in these recriminations. Perhaps they are fully justified but certainly they are not in place at this hour. I sincerely hope that you will be able to persuade the Conference Committee of the Trustees to follow a fair and constructive program for the immediate future and to omit everything else. There is no longer any use of our debating as to who is to blame or in preferring charges against brethren.

With every good wish, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Form 1220-8

CLASS OF SERVICE

This is a full-rate Telegram or Cablegram unless its character is indicated by a symbol in the check or in the address.

WESTERN UNION

NEWCOMB CARLTON, PRESIDENT — J. C. WILLEVER, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

SYMBOLS	
BLUE	Day Letter
NITE	Night Message
NL	Night Letter
LCO	Deferred
CLT	Cable Letter
WLT	Week End Letter

The filing time as shown in the date line on full-rate telegrams and day letters, and the time of receipt at destination as shown on all messages, is STANDARD TIME.

Received at 175 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 1929 APR 27 PM 12 03

PA15 122 DL=WO PHILADELPHIA PENN 27 1125A

DR ROBERT E SPEER=
156 FIFTH AVE NEWYORK NY=

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR LETTER JUST RECEIVED STOP HAVE WITHDRAWN MY LETTER TO MORGAN AND HAVE WIRED MCEWAN AND LAIRD AS FOLLOWS QUOTE FURTHER CONSIDERATION HAS LED ME TO BELIEVE THAT MY LETTER TO MI NOT MORGAN A COPY OF WHICH I SENT YOU ON APRIL TWENTY FIFTH MAY BE OPEN TO AN INTERPRETATION WHICH I DID NOT AT ALL INTEND THAT IT SHOULD HAVE STOP THEREFORE I AM WITHDRAWING IT AND MORGAN IS RETURNING IT TO ME STOP PLEASE THEREFORE KINDLY RETURN THE COPY I SENT YOU AND CONSIDER THE LETTER AS NEVER WRITTEN STOP AM MOST ANXIOUS TO BE ABSOLUTELY LOYAL IN THOUGHT AND DEED TO ALL THAT THE GROUP OF SIX HAS ENDEAVORED TO DO STOP END QUOTE KINDEST REGARDS=

:LEWIS S MUDGE.

Wm L. McEwan

Third Presbyterian Church.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

April 27, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City, N. Y.

My Dear Robert:

Since my return from Bermuda, where I had a most delightful visit with Dr. Patton, I have had to be absent a couple of days and have found my work so crowded that I have not followed my impulee to write to you. I will not try to take anything up in order connected with the Princeton situation. I do not think our Committee can change the Report committed to us, and it has been my hope that Dr. Thompson's Committee, with some explanation of how we came to arrive at our conclusions, would be willing to in the main endorse our report. It contains the essential feature of their report in that we provide for one Board of Control, but it does it in so much less drastic and arbitrary way. I am more and more amazed at our inability to make others see our point of view or to lead them to believe that we have not been obstinate and have worked in the right spirit. Dr. Patton explained that he could not eign our report without deeply wounding the colleagues with whom he had been associated on the Faculty for many yeare, but I found his judgment was that our report had the only hope of success.

Concerning the wisdom and usefulness of my addressing a letter to members of the Board of Trustees, I am in doubt. I am quite ready to do anything I can. Your suggestion that it would be wise to wait until after their meeting on the seventh of May, I think is unquestionably wise. After that we may have further light. It has been intimated to me from some source that Dr. Thompson expects to invite our Committee to appear at the time of the meeting of his Committee on May 10th. I have not written to him and do not know whether the courtesies require him to invite us, or us to ask to be invited. I would prefer that Dr. Thompson would invite us to come and personally lay the report of the Directors before them for explanation. Again I am willing to do whatever is best. In the pressure of things here, I have not been able to put my mind upon the remaining questions relating to our Committee. I do not know whether you and I and Laird need to get together to definitely take action on what we ought to do or not. We can get together at the time of the meeting of the Board of Directors on the sixth of May. We hardly could get together earlier. I have to be in Philadelphia on Tuesday, the 30th of April, to attend a meeting of the Presbyterian Publishing Company. I hardly belong to any organization now that is not troubled with divisions. If you have any clear convictione as to our duty as a Committee I shall be glad to hear from you. I saw Dr. Laird yesterday at the meeting of the Board of National Miseions. I did not have a moment to run in to see you. I have had a nice letter from Dr. Morgan and some letters from Dr. Mudge. I think all of them are agreed that it would not be wise to approach the Board of Trustees until after they hold their meeting. I have had no correspondence with Dr. Thompson. As I recall what I have dictated, I think this letter contains no information nor sensible suggestions, but is simply an effort to get back into working relations with you.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

April 29, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

S

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

Your letter of April 26th was received while I was absent from my Office, but Mr. Barraclough was fortunate enough to get me on the telephone to read it to me at Atlantic City. I at once wired you and the others interested and you are aware how promptly I acted upon your suggestion. I thank you warmly for it. You are probably right in thinking that my letter to Minot Morgan might be interpreted in a way in which I did not intend. I have, therefore, withdrawn it and appreciate your loyalty to me.

Ever affectionately yours,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Wm L McEwan

Third Presbyterian Church.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

MAY 2 - 1929

April 29, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
Board of Foreign Missions
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City, N. Y.

My Dear Dr. Speer:

A telegram from Dr. Mudge announces the time and place of the meeting of the Committee of Eleven. The telegram doubtless was sent in order that we might prepare to come before that Committee. I am sending you a copy of the letter that I have just written to Dr. Mudge. I would like to have the opinion of the other members of our Committee of Three as to the suggestion of having Dr. Mudge suggest to Dr. Thompson our willingness to come if we are invited by him. I think if you would write to Dr. Mudge your attitude about this, it would cause him to make the suggestion to Dr. Thompson if our Committee is unanimously of that opinion.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl
enc.

April 29, 1929.

Rev. Lewis S. Mudge, D.D.
Office of the General Assembly
Witherspoon Building
Philadelphia, Pa.

My Dear Dr. Mudge:

Your telegram informing me that Dr. Thompson's Committee will meet in the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia on Friday, May 10th, has been received. As I wrote you, I am in doubt what the proprieties of the situation require. I do not know whether Dr. Thompson, as Chairman of the Committee of Eleven, should invite our Committee to appear before them, or whether ~~are~~ our Committee of Three should request the privilege of coming before the Committee of Eleven. Perhaps I am guided by my feelings more than is proper, but I wish that Dr. Thompson would invite us to appear rather than for us to request the privilege of coming. It seems to me that the whole Committee of Three should come before this Committee if anyone does. If only one should appear, I think it would be better for Dr. Laird, who lives in Philadelphia, to represent the Committee. If only one member of the Committee appears, it does not seem to me to make particular difference which one that should be. Dr. Laird is quite as acceptable and capable a member of the Committee as any. Inasmuch as our report is committed to us by the Board of Directors, I would not consider that we have the privilege of altering its recommendations. Therefore, it would be necessary for us to state this to Dr. Thompson's Committee in order that we do not have them thinking we have come to a conference in which we can arrive at different conclusions than those of the report. It might even be that the sending of our report to Dr. Thompson's Committee would accomplish all that our presence would do. If, however, it would be more courteous for us to accompany our report, or if any explanation we could give would enable them to better understand it, then the whole Committee, it would seem to me, should go together.

The purpose of my letter is to get your judgment on the way of approach and your good offices in suggesting to Dr. Thompson that we would be pleased as a Committee to be invited to appear before the Committee of which he is Chairman.

Faithfully yours,

wlm;arl
CC: Dr. Speer
Dr. Laird

Lewis S. Mudge

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

May 2, 1929.

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
Dr. John B. Laird.

Dear Friends:

Enclosed please find copy of a letter received this morning from Dr. McEwan, also a copy of my reply.

With kind regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

(COPY)

PITTSBURGH, PA.

April 29, 1929.

Rev. Lewis S. Mudge, D.D.,
Office of the General Assembly,
Witherspoon Building,
Philadelphia, Pa.

My dear Dr. Mudge:

Your telegram informing me that Dr. Thompson's Committee will meet in the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia on Friday, May 10th, has been received. As I wrote you, I am in doubt what the proprieties of the situation require. I do not know whether Dr. Thompson, as Chairman of the Committee of Eleven, should invite our Committee to appear before them, or whether our Committee of Three should request the privilege of coming before the Committee of Eleven. Perhaps I am guided by my feelings more than is proper, but I wish that Dr. Thompson would invite us to appear, rather than for us to request the privilege of coming. It seems to me that the whole Committee of Three should come before this Committee if anyone does. If only one should appear, I think it would be better for Dr. Laird, who lives in Philadelphia, to represent the Committee. If only one member of the Committee appears, it does not seem to me to make particular difference which one that should be. Dr. Laird is quite as acceptable and capable a member of the Committee as any. Inasmuch as our report is committed to us by the Board of Directors, I would not consider that we have the privilege of altering its recommendations. Therefore, it would be necessary for us to state this to Dr. Thompson's Committee in order that we do not have them thinking we have come to a conference in which we can arrive at different conclusions than those of the report. It might even be that the sending of our report to Dr. Thompson's Committee would accomplish all that our presence would do. If, however, it would be more courteous for us to accompany our report, or if any explanation we could give would enable them to better understand it, then the whole Committee, it would seem to me, should go together.

The purpose of my letter is to get your judgment on the way of approach and your good office in suggesting to Dr. Thompson that we would be pleased as a Committee to be invited to appear before the Committee of which he is Chairman.

Faithfully yours,

William L. McEwan (signed)

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

May 2, 1929.

Rev. William L. McEwan, D.D.,
906 S. Negley Ave.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

My dear Dr. McEwan:

I have your letter of April 29th. I am strongly of the opinion that all the members of the Committee appointed by the Board of Directors to care for the interests of the report of the Board to the next General Assembly should appear in Philadelphia on Friday morning, May 10th, at 10 o'clock, (daylight saving time). Doubtless by this time you have received the letter which Dr. Thompson requested me to address to the members of the Board of Directors who have signed the report of the Directors to the General Assembly, namely, seventeen. In accordance with his directions which were official I acting officially as Stated Clerk have done what he requested. I suppose that it is all right for Dr. Thompson to wish this notice sent to the seventeen. He knew, however, before he made it that the Board of Directors had appointed a Committee of Three to represent their interests and consequently the interests of the seventeen. I consider Dr. Thompson's invitation to the seventeen the equivalent of an invitation to the Committee of which you are the Chairman. I, therefore, suggest that you write to Dr. Thompson, 55 Woodland Ave., Columbus, Ohio, stating that you with Speer and Laird have been appointed a Committee to represent the Directors in this matter and that you will appear as such in response to his invitation.

I do not intend to appear before Dr. Thompson's Committee myself. There is not occasion that I know of why I should. The interests to which I have related myself are those which you with Speer and Laird represent. I quite agree with you that you should make it clear if and when you write to Dr. Thompson that you and your Committee associates have no privilege in the way of altering the recommendations of the report of the Directors. I feel, however, that through the members of your Committee Dr. Thompson's Committee should have the impress made with reference to the report of the Directors which the transmission of it in printed form would not convey. Dr. Thompson's

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Committee should know directly something of the prayer and thought and co-operation and honorable compromise which have been put into this report. Whatever may be the merits of its letter it seems to me the merits of its spirit are the greater.

I am all the more of the above opinion because Dr. Thompson is inviting the Board of Trustees to be present. Doubtless, the Conference Committee of the Trustees will be there and if your Committee is not there certainly the balance will not be properly maintained. I had visits on Tuesday in my office from Mr. Morgan and Mr. Pugh. They told me of what happened at the meeting of the Conference Committee of the Trustees held at Princeton on Monday, April 29th. Briefly it would seem as if this Committee had decided to refrain from urging upon the Board of Trustees the adoption for transmission to the General Assembly of a document arraigning or criticizing the Directors.

Dr. Morgan said that he thought that the outcome of this Committee meeting which he attended by direction of the Trustees and as an additional member, would result in a modified re-approval by the Trustees of the Thompson report. I say a modified approval because it seems to be generally agreed that the legal procedure in connection with the securing of charter changes is not as yet well defined and that it is likely that it will not be defined until a friendly suit is instituted in the court of jurisdiction. Dr, Morgan said that the Conference Committee was likely to recommend to the Trustees the holding in the back-ground of a compromise, namely, that the report of the Directors be adopted as a basis with one major change, namely, that the new Board of Trustees consist of not more than thirty-six members all of whom should be chosen from the membership of the present Boards and in a fair proportion as between the two Boards.

The strength that will be behind a compromise like this if proposed is to be found in the conviction that I know Dr. Thompson entertains as well as many members of the Board of Trustees that those who have failed to sign the report of the Directors to the General Assembly are so hopelessly wedded

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

to the past as to be of little service for the future. If the Board of Trustees should present such a compromise and it should be adopted by the Assembly and Dr. Thompson's Committee authorized to make the selection of members, I sincerely hope that the General Assembly's Committee will remember that there are irreconcilables among the Trustees as well as among the Directors.

As to the last paragraph of your letter, I shall be most glad to present your request as Chairman for a hearing before Dr. Thompson's Committee, but I believe it would be much better for you to communicate with him direct as suggested above.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Dr. Speer and Dr. Laird.

With warmest personal regards, believe me

Yours sincerely,

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

Lewis S. Mudge

Special Delivery

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EXECUTIVE HEAD
REV. LEWIS S. MUDGE, D.D., LL.D.
STATED CLERK

GENERAL OFFICE
514 WITHERSPOON BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

May 8, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

My dear Bobby:

I have your letter of May 7th and its several enclosures. Thank you so much for sharing them with me. One of these enclosures, namely, your letter to Dr. Craig I have had rewritten today associating myself with you in its statements and making no other change in the wording. As our names are so intimately associated in the editorial which gives origin to this letter, I have thought that perhaps you would not be unwilling to send a letter to Dr. Craig bearing both our signatures. If for any reason whatever this does not seem to be advisable to you, I know you will not hesitate to so indicate. I shall hope to see you on Friday morning.

Ever affectionately yours,

Lewis S. Mudge

Lewis S. Mudge
Stated Clerk

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S ROOM

May 8, 1929.

Dear Robert:-

I cannot thank you enough for your affectionate and comforting letter which has just come to hand and which Florence and I have read with deepest appreciation.

I was greatly astonished that the Directors should present such a sudden change of front. The election of Mr. Shrader, an ally of Dr. Craig who is hand and glove with him in determined opposition to a single Board of control, to succeed Mr. Perkins is a clear indication that some of the men who joined in the report of the majority of seventeen to the General Assembly have no heart in it. They are like those in the olden time who feared the Lord and served their own gods.

Dr. Warfield in nominating Dr. Van Til pursued the same tactics as were employed when Dr. Machen was nominated and there is clear evidence of stealth and duplicity.

Regarding the questionnaire which has been circulated among the students, it is very difficult to get at the facts. The Student Cabinet, of which Dr. Robert Dick Wilson is the Adviser and which is in close collusion with Dr. Machen, refuse to give a list of those who signed the questionnaire. It is known that the chief leader in this matter among the students is Herbert V. Hotchkiss, a Baptist fundamentalist, who, as I told you, has been appointed Chairman of the Student Missionary Committee to select speakers and generally promote mission interest in the student body. The men who got up a counter petition are the strong men of the Seminary. The two who head the list obtained in competition from the Board of Education the Daniel W. Poor Scholarships amounting to one thousand dollars each. The circular was foisted on the students without a moment's notice and rushed through to avoid as far as possible any counter movement. It is safe to assume that practically all the students have no understanding of the real situation except as it is misrepresented to them by those who are in the councils of certain majority members of the Faculty. I have made it a point not to discuss the matter with the students but some have come to me expressing their conviction that although the origin of the movement is in the Faculty it was negotiated through Directors who reside here in Princeton, and is being financed by them.

You will be interested to learn that at the meeting of the Board of Trustees yesterday by a vote of fifteen to two it reaffirmed its approval of the report of the Committee of Eleven. This is embodied in a paper carefully prepared and which will be published in the official Bulletin of the Assembly.

In response to the request from the Directors to approve the election of Dr. Van Til and appropriate a salary, the Board

voted to postpone action until final disposition is made of the matters concerning Princeton Seminary before the General Assembly in the report of its Special Committee. This infuriated Dr. Laird, who had all that he could bear, and left the meeting at this point without asking to be excused.

Alex Mackie of Sharon Hill was elected to succeed Dr. Knox, so that Dean Magie, feebly aided and abetted by Dr. Laird constitute now the sole minority in the Board of Trustees.

We had a great day yesterday and Dr. McLeod gave us a thoughtful, earnest address, which met with general approval. Some, however, are up in rebellion because he did not mention the name of John Calvin, and furthermore was so "wicked" as to suggest that creeds should be revised from time to time just as we have to get out new geographical maps. Those who mingled freely with the Alumni and whose judgment is reliable declare that the sentiment among the graduates of the Seminary is overwhelmingly for a reorganization.

Gratefully and affectionately yours,

J. Ross Stevenson

Robert E. Speer, D.D.,
New York City.

Wm L. McEwan

Third Presbyterian Church.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

May 13, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City, N. Y.

My Dear Robert:

You had to leave the meeting with the Thompson Committee in Philadelphia before its close, and I did not have an opportunity to confer with you. I was sorry you did not have time to speak. I have not heard anything whatever concerning the conference with the Trustees, nor the result of our presentation of our Report. I had the feeling that we were speaking to an unresponsive group, and that our visit to Philadelphia had accomplished little. Of course, it was our duty to go even if we knew that our efforts would be futile.

Our Report is now the center of the whole controversy. There are those who thing we ought to make a compromise with Dr. Thompson's Committee, and there are those who think we ought to desert our Report and take sides as individuals with either the Thompson Report or the Report of the Minority. My own personal attitude is, that, with all the facts before us, this Group worked out a report which seemed to us the best we could do. The Board of Directors endorsed it by a majority vote. The opposition of the Minority has, of course, furnished an excuse for the Board of Trustees. Both the groups, consisting of the Minority of the Directors and the Majority of the Trustees, have centered their opposition upon our Report more than upon the report of the Committee of Eleven. Nevertheless, it seems to me to be the duty of the Committee of Three, appointed by the Directors, to go forward to the Assembly and present our report as best we can. I have been counting a great deal on the effect that all three of us might have in our presentation of the report. Living here in Pittsburgh, and out of contact with those who are constantly discussing the affair, I am perhaps more inclined to cling to our report. I have little hope of its being adopted by the Assembly without change. If the Assembly makes changes, the responsibility belongs to it. If you have any comfort or courage to spare, send a part of it to me.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl

COPY

F O X & F O X
308-311 Easton Trust Company Building

Easton, Pa.

May 16, 1929

My dearDr. Speer:

I have some information which I received first at the Board of Trustees and afterward at the meeting of the Committee of Eleven. I do not wish to be guilty of an impropriety or to violate confidence but I feel that you ought to know, if you have not already learned it, that the Conference Committee of the Board of Trustees are expecting an overture of settlement from your Committee. In the report which they made to the Committee of Eleven they did not say that the Trustees had at their last meeting voted to favor a Board composed of eighteen Directors and fifteen Trustees. When inquiry was made as to this Dr. ~~Mc~~ McDowell said that in the case of a conference with your committee, they were ready to make that proposition. I do not know whether this will aid in the harmonious adjustment but I felt that I ought to give you this information and you can use your discretion as to whether you use it or not.

Yours sincerely,

(Edward J. Fox,

Reverend Dr. Robert E. Speer
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City

May 17, 1922

The Honorable Edward J. Fox,
508-511 Easton Trust Company Building
Easton, Pa.

My dear Judge Fox:

Your very kind note of yesterday is just received and I am taking the liberty of reporting it at once to Dr. McEwen. I think he feels, however, that our Committee of Three, consisting of myself and Dr. Laird and me, has no authority to modify the proposal of the majority of the Board of Directors but would have to carry any proposal of modification back to the Board.

It would be too late now, however, to have another meeting of the Board, or even of the signers of the majority report, before the meeting of the Assembly. Perhaps Dr. McEwen will be able to make some suggestion, however, and I am asking him if he will not write to you and if he thinks best take matters up with the Committee of the Board of Trustees.

With sincere regard,

Very faithfully yours,

RES/B

May 17, 1929

Rev. William L. McEwan, D.D.,
906 So. Negley Avenue,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

My dear William:

Your good letter of May 13th was received yesterday and I share fully with you your solicitude over these difficult problems.

I think you made as good a statement as could have been made at the meeting with the Committee of Eleven. If there had been more time I should have been glad to speak also, but I doubted whether any words at that time would be of service.

I have just received this morning the enclosed letter from Judge Fox, with which I am sending a copy of my reply. You know how sympathetically and earnestly Judge Fox has worked with us in this matter and I think it would be very nice if you could write to him.

Our Committee of Three is indeed in a very difficult position. We know that the majority of the Trustees whom we represent have divergent views on some questions. We heard Dr. Radcliffe's statement when we met the Committee of Eleven and we know that there are others who have joined with us but who take just the opposite view from Dr. Radcliffe.

I should suppose that Dr. Craig and the minority would oppose such a suggestion as is contained in Judge Fox's letter, but I should think, though I may be wrong, that most of the majority might be willing to accept it inasmuch as it rests on the principle to which the majority had agreed of having one Board made up of the two present Boards. It is too bad that we would not have presented such a proposition as this to the Board of Directors as an alternative to our present report. We could then have ascertained whether they would be willing to entertain such a suggestion.

I have had no discussion of the matter since we met in Philadelphia with any of the Directors or Trustees or the Committee of Eleven. I saw Dr. Herrick but we had not more than a dozen words on the subject. I believe we could work out the problem all right and with full harmonious adjustment if it were not for the strong convictions and immovable attitudes of the majority of the Directors. They disapprove of the report of the Committee of Eleven and also of the action of the Trustees and they say they disapprove still more of the report of the majority of the Directors. They would disapprove also, of course, of the suggestion in Judge Fox's letter. I do not see accordingly that there is any possibility of a general agreement and there is no time now for you to consult all of the majority of the Directors to ascertain whether they would be willing to authorize you to depart in any respect from the majority report in the direction of some such adjustment as Judge Fox's letter suggests.

Perhaps, as you say, there is nothing for us to do as a Committee of Three but to present our report as best we can. The weakness of our position of course will be that we were instructed by the last General Assembly to compose our difficulties and that our report will be met in the Assembly by a strong minority of our own Board declaring that we have not composed them at all and opposing in the strongest way our attempted method of composition

I think with Dr. Laird that there is absolute need of a full re-organization, both of the Boards and of the institution within. The last section of Dr. Macartney's article in "The Presbyterian" and "The Banner" stating that after all, things are doing very well within the Seminary, is overwhelmingly contradicted by the students' statement which has been sent out.

It may be there is nothing more we can do but just look to God to govern the action of the Assembly and to control the issues thereof.

With warm regard,

Ever affectionately yours,

RES/B

TWJ

Delhi, N. Y.
May 13, 1929

Dr. Robert E. Speer
156 5th Ave.
New York, N. Y.

My dear Robert:

It looks to me that yours must be the compelling voice if our majority report, prepared so largely by you and Mudge, is to be carried through the Assembly. The repeated declarations of Drs. Craig and others that the Thompson report is better than ours greatly hinders us. I was stunned with amazement to hear that one of our group had written suggesting that the Group report be adopted with number of new board reduced to 33 or 35. I was glad you, as was told me, repudiated such a plan as treachery, which it certainly would be. I find my bosom friend, Laird, is rather lukewarm. Consequently, it is up to you. If you speak as earnestly and logically as you did to Trustees you will sweep the Assembly.

I have set aside my first preference

1) To show a spirit of compromise.

2) Because after all this heat two boards will trip and nullify each other.

3) Because I think that to put off any man who has served any length of time on either board will be a cruel, unjust, iniquitous performance for no reason other than that they displeased a few people. No one deserves that harsh treatment from his church.

Yours truly,

W. Courtland Robinson

WCR:MAL

May 17,1929

The Rev. W. Cortland Robinson,D.D.,
Delhi, N.Y.

My dear Cort,

Your letter of the 14th is just received following receipt of letters from Dr. McEwan and Judge Fay with regard to our very difficult problem. Dr. McEwan and Dr. Laird and I met the Committee of Eleven last week in Philadelphia. Dr. Radcliff was there also. After we were heard a committee of the Trustees was to appear. Dr. McEwan made a very good statement for us. Our difficulty, as I see it, lies in the fact of the strong opposition of the minority of the Board of Directors. If our Board of Directors had been able to agree with practical unanimity I should have expected that the Trustees would have agreed with us too and that then the Committee of Eleven would have concurred. Even if the Trustees had not been prepared to agree, we would have been in a very strong position if the Board of Directors had been unanimous or substantially so. But a minority of ten members of the Board rejects absolutely our majority report, and some of its members publicly declare that the report of the Committee of Eleven is preferable to our. They say that to put the two Boards together, as we propose, means an impossible situation, assuring continued disagreement and involving probably litigation in the courts. It will be argued, accordingly, that our proposition involves the forcing into a common Board of elements that are absolutely opposed to it, or of forcing their resignation in order to protect their consciences. I am not raising these objections myself, but am trying to think of how they can be met and we must honestly face the difficulties of our task. It is far more difficult than when we met the Trustees and I made the statement to which you so kindly refer. If you have any suggestions as to the matter, please send them on to Dr. McEwan or Dr. Laird or me at St. Paul. I expect to be at the St. Paul Hotel.

Another difficulty in our position is that we do not know the minds of all the members of the majority, and as to what their present view would be, in the light of the attitude and statements of the minority and in the light of the later action of the Board of Trustees. Dr. McEwan has felt, and it has been my view too, that our Committee of Three was limited to doing just one thing, namely, to stating as effectively as we can the position as represented in the majority report. Our problem is how we can do this as effectively as possible in the light of the facts with regard to the minority of our Board and the position of the Board of Trustees?

As to Dr. Laird of whom you speak, I think I can understand fully his position. He believes, and I think justly, that it is impossible for the two Boards to go on as at present, still less to go on with the Board of Trustees reduced to a pure holding corporation, as proposed in Dr. Craig's report. The Trustees will never agree to this. As a matter of fact they never have been merely such a holding corporation, and are not now. It is they who alone are legally qualified to issue the diplomas of the Seminary; it is they who have

complete control of the Library, which is the largest single educational factor in any institution; they have been able to secure exemption from taxation solely because they are an educational corporation, and they can indisputably check the Board of Directors by refusing to vote the funds for the support of professors and other purposes. Dr. Laird sees, as it seems to me that any one must see, that the present situation cannot go on, and that either we must have two Boards that are of one mind and are able to cooperate, or we must have one Board and, of course, such a Board ought also to be a more harmonious and united Board than our Board of Directors has been.

If you have any light, please send it on as I have said, especially as to how we can meet the objections to our majority report that will be based upon the attitude and report of the minority of our Board.

Very cordially yours,

RWS:C.

Copy

Princeton, N.J.
May 9, 1929.

Dr. J. Ross Stevenson,
Princeton Theological Seminary,
Princeton, N.J.

Dear President Stevenson:-

You have no doubt read with amazement the article written to the Trenton Evening Times and published in that paper on May 8, under the heading "Students Endorse Majority Group". I understand the New York Times ran a still longer and more detailed statement to the same effect. It is a disgusting piece of misrepresentation and distortion of facts. It betrays the same insidious practise that characyerized the conduct of the questionaire, upon which the article is based. That questionaire was not "circulated"; it was maneuvered. It was uncalled for, misleading and ambiguous in its statement of the questions. The purpose of those who engineered it was certainly not to obtain an impartial estimate of student opinion. The object was altogether too obvious. For that reason many of us refused to have anything to do with the matter, since it was our conviction that entire abstinence from any controversial engagements in the student body best suited our position and knowledge and best served the institution we love. Over sixty unsolicited names were signed to a protest against the above-mentioned questionaire. This alone would disprove the impression conveyed by this newspaper article.

The fact that the publishing of this article was delayed until after Commencement is an added indication of the questionable methods employed. There would be no opportunity to register a contrary opinion. And so the article stands as a flagrant example of unfair dealing, unwise agitation, unnecessary publicity and thoroughly unChristian ethics.

I am writing this because I know I am reflecting the sentiment of a considerable and prominent proportion of the class of 1929, men who have consistently declined to engage in bootless quarreling or to participate in partisan propagandism, men who cannot afford to allow their message to be obscured or their time wasted by such practise. We deeply regret this latest mistake, and assure you we would have done all in our power to prevent it if we had had the opportunity.

Very cordially yours,

(signed) John Arthur Visser.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PRESIDENT'S ROOM

May 16, 1929

My dear Robert:-

As you made inquiry regarding the agitation here among the students, I thought you would be interested in a copy of a letter which I recently received from one of the strongest men in the Senior Class who won the Hugh Davies Prize in Homiletics. This was written while I was away from home and as I have had no opportunity to see Mr. Visser, it might not be well to give publicity to the letter without his consent

Relations are more tense here than they have ever been and unless the General Assembly takes definite action in the way of relief, the future of the Seminary looks lamentablly dark. Capital is being made out of the fact that we have a large attendance of students. The enrollment of new students, however, last Autumn was away behind that of the preceeding year and if matters continue to drag along, students from such Presbyterian colleges as Lafayette, Wooster, et al, will go elsewhere, and the institution will be filled up with rampant fundamentalists from institutions which hitherto have been sending their students to Bible Schools.

Affectionately yours,

J. Ross Stevenson

Robert E. Speer, D.D.,

New York City.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

Rev. Samuel C. Craig, D.D.

The Presbyterian,

1217 Market Street,

Philadelphia, Pa.

156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

May 7, 1929

Rev. Samuel C. Craig, D.D.,
The Presbyterian
1217 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Dr. Craig:

At the meeting of the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary yesterday afternoon I had intended, on a point of personal privilege, to make a simple but earnest protest against the insinuation in the opening paragraph of your leading editorial entitled "Reports of the Directors of Princeton Seminary," in "The Presbyterian" of April 25th, 1929. I concluded, however, to say nothing public but to send you this personal note.

You will remember that I spoke to you at a meeting of the Board of Directors in March with regard to the statement in "The Presbyterian" of March 7th, charging that the effort had been deliberately and purposely made "to prevent the Board of Directors from presenting a unanimous report to the next Assembly, in the hope and expectation that if the Board of Directors goes to the next Assembly with a divided report, it could be maintained that, the Directors having proven themselves incompetent to perform the task assigned it, the re-organization of the Seminary proposed by the Committee of Eleven should be adopted."

I asked you to whom this implication might refer: You declared that you had no one in mind. I answered that I thought it certainly was wrong to make such a statement unless there were ground for it and that such ground could only be found in the actions of individuals. I told you also that the only persons of whom I knew who were trying to prevent unanimity on the Board of Directors were yourself and your associates but that certainly you would not be making such self accusations and it was inconceivable that you could have ~~any~~ view in seeking to prevent unanimity ~~to get~~ the promotion of the adoption of the Thompson report. I said further that the only other persons to whom you might conceivably refer were either Dr McEwan and Dr. Laird, or Dr. Mudge and myself, and that in either case your statement was absolutely unwarranted and untrue.

Now in your issue of April 25th in the paragraph referred to you explicitly name Dr. Mudge and myself and the implied charge is unmistakable that Dr. Mudge and I have sought to create or to ~~compose~~ continue differences in the Board of Directors in order to promote the adoption of the Report of the Committee of Eleven. This charge or insinuation is absolutely unwarranted and untrue and its publication in "The Presbyterian" by you as a Director of the Seminary,

reflecting on the good faith of your fellow directors, passes all bounds of propriety and honor.

Dr. Mudge and I have done our best, in honorable association with Dr. McEwan and Dr. Laird, in the attempt to discharge a duty which we did not seek but which was laid upon us on Dr. Warfield's motion and, if I remember aright, by unanimous action of the Board of Directors, to find a harmonious way to compose the difficulties of the Seminary. Working together with full mutual confidence from the beginning, we have done our best to compose our difficulties with regard to the Faculty, with regard to the Directors and with regard to the Trustees.. It has not been our fault that we have failed in the matter of the Board of Directors, and our motive throughout has not been to assure failure of agreement, as you charge, but to secure agreement. It is wrong and untruthful and dishonorable to charge us with bad faith or with the secret purpose of preventing the harmonious agreement of the Board.

We are ready to recognize your conscientiousness and loyalty to conviction in your position. We have said not one word with regard to your motives or spirit. Surely you should be equally just and brotherly.

I write this not to invite any controversy, either public or private, but simply as a frank and honest word from man to man within the fellowship of our Board of Directors.

Very sincerely yours,

RES/B

May 9, 1929

Rev. Samuel C. Craig, D.D.,
"The Presbyterian"
1217 Market Street,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Dr. Craig:

At the meeting of the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary on Monday afternoon last, we had intended on a point of personal privilege to make a simple but earnest protest against the insinuation in the opening paragraph of your leading editorial entitled "Reports of the Directors of Princeton Seminary" in "The Presbyterian" of April 25th, 1929. We concluded, however, to say nothing public but to send you this personal note.

You will remember that Dr. Speer spoke to you at a meeting of the Board of Directors in March with regard to the statement in "The Presbyterian" of March 7th, charging that the effort had been deliberately and purposely made "to prevent the Board of Directors from presenting a unanimous report to the next Assembly, in the hope and expectation that if the Board of Directors goes to the next Assembly with a divided report, it could be mtaintained that, the Directors having proven themselves incompetent to perform the task assigned it, the re-organization of the Seminary proposed by the Committee of Eleven should be adopted."

Dr. Speer asked you to whom this implication might refer: you declared that you had no one in mind. He answered that he thought it certainly was wrong to make such a statement unless there were ground for it and that such ground could only be found in the actions of individuals. He told you also that the only persons of whom he knew who were trying to prevent unanimity on the Board of Directors were yourself and your associates, but that certainly you would not be making such self accusations and it was inconceivable that you could have in view in seeking to prevent unanimity the promotion of the adoption of the Thompson report. He said further that the only other persons to whom you might conceivably refer were either Dr. McEwen and Dr. Laird, or Dr. Mudge and himself, and that in either case your statement was absolutely unwarranted and untrue.

Now in your issue of April 25th in the paragraph referred to you explicitly name us and the implied charge is unmistakably that we have sought to create or to continue differences in the Board of Directors in order to promote the adoption of the Report of the Committee of Eleven. This charge or insinuation is absolutely unwarranted and

Dr. Craig:

untruo and its publication in "The Presbyterian" by you as a Director of the Seminary reflecting on the good faith of your fellow directors, passes all bounds of propriety and honor.

We have done our best, in honorable association with Dr. McEwen and Dr. Laird, in the attempt to discharge a duty which we did not seek byt which was laid upon us on Dr. Warfield's motion and, if we remember aright, by unanimous action of the Board of Directors, to find a harmonious way to compose the difficulties of the Seminary. Working together with full mutual confidence from the beginning, we have done our best to compose our difficulties with regard to the Faculty, with regard to the Directors and with regard to the Trustees. Ut has not been our fault that we have failed in the matter of the Board of Directors, and our motive throughout has not been to assure failure of agreement, as you charge, but to secure agreement. It is wrong and untruthful and dishonorable to charge us with bad faith or with the secret purpose of preventing the harmonious agreement of the Board.

We are ready to recognize your conscientiousness and loyalty to conviction in your position. We havensaid not one word with regard to your motives or spirit. Surely you should be equally just and brotherly.

We write this not to invite any controversy, either public or private, but simply as a frank and honest word from man to man, within the fellowship of our Board of Directors.

Very sincerely yours,

EDITORIAL ROOMS
THE PRESBYTERIAN
1217 MARKET STREET, PHILADELPHIA

73 Stockton Street
Princeton, N.J.

Dr. Lewis S. Mudge
and
Dr. Robert E. Speer

Dear Drs. Mudge and Speer:

I do not know as that your joint letter of the 9th instant calls for any reply. I feel, however, that I should say that Dr. Speer must have misunderstood me in my reference to my statement in the Presbyterian of March 7th. I of course had certain persons in mind when I wrote those words and persons other than myself and my associates. Moreover I believe that statement to be true. Dr. Speer asked me to name the persons I had in mind. As these persons included both those within and without the Board I did not feel that I was under obligation to do as he requested. My specific reference to you both in the Presbyterian of April 25th I believe to be altogether ~~xxxx~~ true, viz., that you have both been partisans of the proposed reorganization of the Seminary since its inception. Moreover I have not gotten the impression that you were desirous of composing the differences in the Seminary - except it be along the line proposed by the Thompson Committee. It was within your power on June 20th last to have secured an action that would have received the practically unanimous support of the Directors - there is really no reasons why the Trustees should have been consulted in this connection - but as that action would have involved Dr. Stevenson giving up the presidency and taking a professorship and so meant that his ambitions as President were not to be realized, you opposed the action. It is a matter of record that you both favor the Thompson plan. You must have known that there was no possibility of obtaining harmonious action by way of supporting President Stevenson's inclusive policy. I did not intend to charge you with bad faith.

Very sincerely yours
Samuel G. Craig

May 16, 1929

Duplicate

May 17, 1929

Rev. William L. McEwan, D.D.,
906 So. Negley Avenue,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

My dear William:

Your good letter of May 15th was received yesterday and I share fully with you your solicitude over these difficult problems.

I think you made as good a statement as could have been made at the meeting with the Committee of Eleven. If there had been more time I should have been glad to speak also, but I doubted whether any words at that time would be of service.

I have just received this morning the enclosed letter from Judge Fox, with which I am sending a copy of my reply. You know how sympathetically and earnestly Judge Fox has worked with us in this matter and I think it would be very nice if you could write to him.

Our Committee of Three is indeed in a very difficult position. We know that the majority of the Trustees whom we represent have divergent views on some questions. We heard Dr. Radcliffe's statement when we met the Committee of Eleven and we know that there are others who have joined with us but who take just the opposite view from Dr. Radcliffe.

I should suppose that Dr. Craig and the minority would oppose such a suggestion as is contained in Judge Fox's letter, but I should think, though I may be wrong, that most of the majority might be willing to accept it inasmuch as it rests on the principle to which the majority had agreed of having one Board made up of the two present Boards. It is too bad that we could not have presented such a proposition as this to the Board of Directors as an alternative to our present report. We could then have ascertained whether they would be willing to entertain such a suggestion.

I have had no discussion of the matter since we met in Philadelphia with any of the Directors or Trustees or the Committee of Eleven. I saw Dr. Herrick but we had not more than a dozen words on the subject. I believe we could work out the problem all right and with full harmonious adjustment if it were not for the strong convictions and immovable attitudes of the minority of the Directors. They disapprove of the report of the Committee of Eleven and also of the action of the Trustees and they say they disapprove still more of the report of the majority of the Directors. They would disapprove also, of course, of the suggestion in Judge Fox's letter. I do not see accordingly that there is any possibility of a general agreement and there is no time now for you to consult all of the majority of the Directors to ascertain whether they would be willing to authorize you to depart in any respect from the majority report in the direction of some such adjustment as Judge Fox's letter suggests.

Perhaps, as you say, there is nothing for us to do as a Committee of Three but to present our report as best we can. The weakness of our position of course will be that we were instructed by the last General Assembly to compose our difficulties and that our report will be met in the Assembly by a strong minority of our own Board declaring that we have not composed them at all and opposing in the strongest way our attempted method ofcomposition.

I think with Dr. Laird that there is absolute need of a full reorganization, both of the Boards and of the institution within. The last section of Dr. Macartney's article in "The Presbyterian" and "The Banner" stating that after all, things are doing very well within the Seminary, is overwhelmingly contradicted by the students' statement which has been sent out.

It may be there is nothing more we can do but just look to God to govern the action of the Assembly and to control the issues thereof.

With warm regard,

Ever affectionately yours,

RRR/B

Princeton, N.J., May 17, 1929.

My dear Robert:-

In the majority report of the Directors the claim is stated that "The Directors, however, believe that progress has been made toward composing the differences of the Seminary since the General Assembly was last in session and are of the opinion that time and patience,etc." Living here on the campus and being in close touch with the situation, we are sorry to be compelled to state, and we do this with great reluctance, that this claim in the majority report cannot be substantiated.

When the Directors undertook their task following the last Assembly, we were eager to cooperate and bring about the consummation desired not only by the Directors but by the whole Church. When the two of us were asked to sign the statements presented, we were in sympathy with their content though convinced that they did not go far enough and would not secure peace. So far as the Faculty is concerned, the agitation caused by the presentation of statements to be signed and a mandate to be obeyed, has simply served not only to accentuate the differences but to arouse antagonism among Faculty members against the Directors themselves, particularly those who have signed the majority report. At the present time the majority of the Faculty are not only arrayed in determined opposition to those whom they rate as being in the minority but in opposition to the Directors themselves; so much so that when the attention of the Faculty was called to the fact that the questionnaire circulated among the students was an act of insubordination against the Directors, the majority of the Faculty declined to take any steps to suppress the evident insubordination. The breach is not only as clear-cut as it has been hitherto, but it is open and Faculty members are more out-spoken in their manifestation of antagonism.

So far as the students are concerned, ever since the League of Evangelical Students was organized, the Association has been divided into opposite camps. So acute have been the differences that a sober-minded, earnest member of the Senior Class declared that his "Junior Year in the Seminary was like hell" and that he could not advise any student to come to Princeton Seminary where there is such a lack of unity in the student body. The misleading questionnaire foisted upon the students by the cabinet of the Association with the tacit consent of Dr. Wilson and sympathizers in the Faculty has stirred up more bad blood than has been seen in the student body for years and we tremble to think of the conflicts in the student body which are sure to be waged in the Autumn.

So far as the relation between the Trustees and Directors is concerned, the fact that the Board of Trustees postponed action concerning the election of a professor jammed through the Board of Directors is certainly unprecedented and indicates a working at cross purposes which is now open and determined. So far as the Directors are concerned, it surely cannot be claimed that progress has been made in the direction of peace when a determined minority is leaving no stone unturned to defeat the majority and is openly threatening a resort

to the courts if this minority cannot have its way.

We therefore believe that to lull the General Assembly into complacency regarding the situation in Princeton Seminary would impose a great wrong upon the institution. Prompt, definite, clear-cut action is required and we believe that the only hope now is in the adoption of the report of the Committee of Eleven. Members of the Faculty who have threatened to resign evidently do not intend to do so as their talk in regard to their plans for another year clearly indicates. Also the threat as to litigation is being made now simply for the purposes of intimidation and is not at all likely to result in any kind of a law suit.

As you and Dr. Mudge, as members of the Group of Six, have been rated as representing the former minority in the Board of Directors and in the Faculty, we feel that in all frankness we should bring the above facts to your earnest consideration.

Very cordially yours,

J. Ross Stevenson

Paul Martin

Charles R. Erdman

Robert E. Speer, D.D.,

New York City.

May 17, 1929

The Honorable Edward J. Fox,
306-311 Easton Trust Company Building
Easton, Pa.

My dear Judge Fox:

Your kind note of yesterday is just received and I am taking the liberty of reporting it at once to Dr. McEwen. I think he feels, however, that our Committee of Three, consisting of himself and Dr. Laird and me, has no authority to modify the proposal of the majority of the Board of Directors but would have to carry any proposal of modification back to the Board.

It would be too late now, however, to have another meeting of the Board, or even of the signers of the majority report, before the meeting of the Assembly. Perhaps Dr. McEwen will be able to make some suggestions, however, and I am asking him if he will not write to you.

With sincere regard,

Very faithfully yours,

RM/B

Third Presbyterian Church.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

May 18, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
Board of Foreign Missions,
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City, N. Y.

My Dear Robert:

Your letter of the seventeenth, written by your own hand, explaining the use of the word "majority" instead of the word "minority" in a letter you had written to me, came by the last mail. I have not yet received the letter in which the correction is to be made. I hope it will come on the next mail. You did not state what its date is, and the one you wrote with your hand seems to have come by an earlier mail than the dictated one. I shall look anxiously for it because I wish to have it before going to the Assembly. I hope to see you there.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl